R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 002 961 24
THE SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT FARM LABORERS--EFFECT OF
MIGRANT FARM LABOR ON THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.
BY- BROOKS, MELVIN S. HILGENDORF, ROBERT L.
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV., CARBONDALE
REPORT NUMBER CRP-401 PUB DATE OCT 60
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$10.36 259P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MIGRANT WORKERS, *AGRICULTURAL LABORERS, *SOCIAL PROBLEMS, *MIGRANT CHILDREN, MIGRANT EDUCATION, FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS, LOW INCOME, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, RACIAL DIFFERENCES, ASPIRATION, ATTITUDES, HEALTH, LIVING STANDARDS, MOBILITY, *SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

MIGRANT LABORERS WHO PICKED STRAWBERRIES IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS IN THE SPRING OF 1958 WERE SURVEYED. THIS PARTICULAR SAMPLE WAS SELECTED FOR STUDY BECAUSE FAR MORE CHILDREN ARE INVOLVED IN THE HARVEST OF STRAWBERRIES THAN IN ANY OTHER FARM TASK OF THE AREA. MIGRANTS WHO WERE INTERVIEWED WERE SELECTED BY SYSTEMATIC RANDOM SAMPLING--A PROCEDURE THAT WORKED WELL FOR MIGRANTS WHO HAD FAMILIES. SINGLE WORKERS WERE UNREPRESENTED IN THE FINAL SAMPLE OF OVER 200 CASES. INFORMATION WAS ALSO GATHERED FROM ABOUT 60 COOPERATING FARMERS AND FROM SCHOOL RECORDS OF THE MIGRANT CHILDREN. DATA WERE OBTAINED ON FAMILY COMPOSITION, EDUCATION, WORK, INCOME, MOBILITY, HEALTH, LIVING CONDITIONS WHILE WORKING IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, ASPIRATIONS, PLANS, AND ATTITUDES. SPECIAL ATTENTION WAS DEVOTED TO OBTAINING ACCURATE DATA ON THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN. ANALYSES WERE CONDUCTED ON THE BASES OF (1) ALL CASES, (2) COMPARISONS BETWEEN WHITES AND NONWHITES, AND (3) COMPARISONS BETWEEN SEMIMOBILE AND MOBILE WHITES. THE LOW SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AMONG THE MIGRANT FARM WORKERS WAS FOUND NOT TO BE CAUSED BY WORKER INFERIORITY (ONLY A MINORITY BEING MARKEDLY INFERIOR), BUT BY A WIDE VARIETY OF ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL FACTORS. ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST SELECTED ISSUES ON THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF FARM WORKERS WERE PRESENTED, INCLUDING EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE-RATE LEGISLATION TO AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT, DISCONTINUANCE OF IMPORTATION OF FARM LABORERS FROM MEXICO, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN, FURTHER CHILD LABOR LEGISLATION, AND LEGISLATION SETTING MINIMUM HOUSING STANDARDS FOR FARM LABORERS. ON THE BASIS OF SURVEY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE MIGRANT FARM LABOR RESEARCH WERE DEVELOPED AND CATEGORIZED. (JH)

ED002961

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT FARM LABORERS

Effect of Migrant Farm Labor on the Education of Children

MELVIN S. BROOKS, Ph.D.--Principal Investigator

Assisted by
Robert L. Hilgendorf, M.A.

Department of Sociology
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois
October 1960

The research reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Project number 401A, SAE8997.

Copyright © 1960 by Melvin S. Brooks.

Manufactured in the United States of America

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers wish to express sincere appreciation to all those who have aided in making this study. The cooperating farmers and migrant laborers were kind enough to take time, even at the peak of their busy season, to supply the needed information.

The United States Office of Education and Southern Illinois University provided nearly all of the funds required for the study, but some financial assistance was also given by the Illinois Commission on Children. The Executive Director of the latter, Miss Naomi Hiett, and other members of the (Illinois) Committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers were very helpful in the early phases of the study.

The interviewers and office personnel were conscientious and a pleasure to work with. Dr. Joseph K. Johnson generously took time to read the first draft of this report. He and Dr. Douglas Rennie, members of the Department of Sociology, made numerous helpful recommendations. Dr. John O. Anderson, Coordinator of Research in the Graduate School of Southern Illinois University, and his staff have given extensive help in the preparation of this report.

Foremost among others who have helped are members of the senior writer's family, whose assistance included many hours of proofreading.

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RELATED SURVEYS OF MIGRANT FARM LABORERS 6

III. PROCEDURE AND CLASSIFICATION 16

Interviews with Farmers 16

Interviews with Migrant Farm Laborers 18

Peach pickers in August 1957 18

Pretesting schedule 18--Sampling difficulties 18

Strawberry pickers in spring 1958 18

Schedule 18--Sampling plan 19--Interviewing 20

Validation through School Records 22

Analysis Procedure 23

The search for types 24

The classification used 26

Plan of Presentation 28

IV. FAMILY COMPOSITION 32

Household Size 32

Characteristics of Family Heads and of Their Wives 33

Sex and marital status 33

Age 34

Education 36

Chapter Page

V. MIGRATION AND OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY 39

Mobility 39

Consecutive weeks spent in home community 39

Number of localities 41

Number of states 42

Home states of migrants 43

Work Obtained 44

Days of work obtained 44

Total 44--Farm 46--Non-farm 48

Number of farm and non-farm jobs 50

How jobs were obtained 53

Cash Income 57

Income of family at farm labor 58

Income of family head at farm labor 60

Income of family head at non-farm labor 61

Total income of family 62

Earnings of children in strawberry harvest 65

Duration of Migrant Farm Labor Patterns 68

Similar patterns for the first five months of 1957 and of 1958 68

Consecutive years migrated to same areas 69

Consecutive years in migrant farm labor 71

Total number of years in migrant farm labor 73

VI. LIVING CONDITIONS, HEALTH, AND MEDICAL CARE 75

Living Conditions 75

Chapter Page

Housing 76

Facilities 79

Health 83

Medical Care 84

Vaccinations and skin test for tuberculosis 84

Smallpox 84--Diphtheria, whooping cough, or tetanus 86--Polio 87--Tuberculosis skin test 87

Examinations 90

Dental 90--By a physician 91

Attitudes Toward Amount of Medical Care 92

VII. EDUCATION OF CHILDREN 95

Enrollment and Attendance 96

Enrollment 96

Attendance 98

Retardation 102

Grade progress by years in school 102

Age-grade status 104

VIII. ASPIRATIONS, PLANS, AND ATTITUDES 111

Concerning Their Children 111

The education of their children 111

Conclusions pertaining to the education of children 116

The occupations of their children 119

Plans and Attitudes Concerning Their Occupation 121

Plans regarding changing work 121

Attitude toward their pattern of life and work 122

Chapter Page

Attitudes Pertaining to Southern Illinois 124

Respondent expects to return 124

Likes and dislikes 126

Attitudes toward community treatment of migrants 130

Attitudes Concerning Problems of Migrants 133

IX. THE EMPLOYING FARMERS AND THEIR FARMS 136

Size of Farms and Chief Crops 136

Age, Tenure Status, and Education of the Farmers 137

Employment Practices of the Farmers 138

How migrant employees were obtained 138

Whom the farmer employs 141

Opinions of the Farmers 143

Pertaining to the employment of migrants 143

Obtaining workers 143--The Employment Service 144--Per cent of workers considered a problem 144--Furnishing lodging 148

Regarding the education of migrant children 149

How far migrant children should go in school 149--Do migrant children have equal educational opportunity? 149--Should migrant children have equal educational opportunity? 150--Summer school for migrant children 151--Financing summer school for migrant children 152

Regarding migrants and the community 152

Should migrants be encouraged to attend local churches? 153--Should migrants be discouraged from going to town? 153--Should migrants leave the community? 154

Regarding migrant farm workers in general 155

Chapter Page

X. DISCUSSION OF ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH 157

Discussion of Issues 157

Why are migrant farm laborers the lowest socio-economic category of large size? 158

Inadequacy of low character, vices, and inferior mentality as explanations 158--National economic trends and factors 162--Other cultural, social, or psychological factors 164

Should the number of domestic migrant farm workers be reduced? 166

Should minimum wage rates for farm work be established? 170

Should the employment of Mexican nationals be reduced? 174

Should summer schools for migrant children be established? 178

Should there be further child labor legislation? 182

Should legislation setting housing standards be adopted? 187

Suggestions for Future Research 190

Make for more use of participant observation and case study methods 190

Study how and why people become migrant farm workers 191

Search for types of migrants and reliable indices of these types 191

Compare migrants who keep returning to the same farms with those who do not 192

Compare migrants with comparable non-migrants 192

Study why some farmers have far less of a labor problem than other farmers 193

Find out the circumstances under which local people would harvest crops 194

Devise and experiment with procedures for rating of workers by the Employment Service 194

Chapter		Page
XI.	SUMMARY	197
	All Cases	198
	Comparisons between Whites and Non-whites	202
	Comparisons between Semi-mobile and Mobile Whites	205
	Discussion, and Suggestions for Future Research	208
APPENDIX A.	THE FARMER SCHEDULE	209
APPENDIX B.	THE FARM LABORER FAMILY SCHEDULE	214
APPENDIX C.	THE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE	223
APPENDIX D.	ESTIMATES OF TOTAL NUMBERSOOF MIGRANT EMPLOYEES	224
	Strawberry Pickers in the Sample Areas	224
	Migrants Who Worked on Union County Farms in 1957	228
APPENDIX E.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	231

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Number of Migrant Employees and School-Age Children, by Class and Race. 29

2. Mean Family Size, by Class and Race. 32

3. Mean Age of Employee, by Class and Race. 35

4. Mean Age of Wife, by Class and Race. 36

5. Mean Highest Grade Completed by Employee, by Class and Race. . 37

6. Mean Highest Grade Completed by Wife, by Class and Race. . . . 38

7. Mean Number of Consecutive Weeks Employee Spent in Home Community in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race 40

8. Number of Consecutive Weeks Employee Spent in Home Community in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories 40

9. Mean Number of Localities in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race of Employee 42

10. Number of Localities in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories of Employees. 42

11. Number of States in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories of Employees. 43

12. Home State, for Selected Categories. 44

13. Mean Total Number of Days Employee Worked in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race. 45

14. Total Number of Days Employee Worked in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. 46

15. Mean Number of Days Employee Worked as Farm Laborer in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race. 46

16. Number of Days Employee Worked as Farm Laborer in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories 47

Table Page

17. Mean Number of Days Employee Worked as Non-Farm Laborer in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race 48

18. Number of Days Employee Worked as Non-Farm Laborer in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories 49

19. Mean Number of Farm Jobs of Employee in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race. 50

20. Number of Farm Jobs of Employee in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. .51

21. Number of Farm and Non-Farm Jobs of Employee in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. 52

22. Mean Number of Farm and Non-Farm Jobs of Employee in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race 52

23. How Employees' Current and Total Farm Jobs for the Year Were Obtained, by Race and Family Status 54

24. Mean Income of Family at Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race. 59

25. Income of Family at Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. 59

26. Mean Income of Family Head at Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race. 60

27. Income of Family Head at Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. .61

28. Mean Income of Family Head at Non-Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, by Class and Race 61

29. Income of Family Head at Non-Farm Labor in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. 62

30. Total Cash Income of Family in Last Twelve Months, for Selected Categories. 63

31. Quarts of Strawberries Picked in One Day by School-Age White Children, by Age 66

32. Estimated Mean Financial Contribution per Family of Children Through Picking Strawberries in Southern Illinois, for Semi-Mobile and Mobile White Families, by Age Groups . . .67

Table Page

33. Employment Pattern for 1957 Similar to Employment Pattern for 1958, for Selected Categories of Employees 69

34. Mean Number of Consecutive Years Employee Migrated to Same Areas, by Class and Race 70

35. Number of Consecutive Years Employee Migrated to Same Areas, for Selected Categories. 71

36. Mean Number of Consecutive Years Employee in Migrant Farm Labor, by Class and Race 72

37. Number of Consecutive Years Employee in Migrant Farm Labor, for Selected Categories. 72

38. Total Number of Years Employee in Migrant Farm Labor, for Selected Categories. 73

39. Nature of Present Housing, for Selected Categories of Employees. 76

40. Nature of Floor, for Selected Categories of Employees. 77

41. Number of Rooms, for Selected Categories of Employees. 78

42. Laundry Facilities, for Selected Categories of Employees 80

43. Bathing Facilities, for Selected Categories of Employees 81

44. Other Facilities and Equipment Furnished by Farmer, for Selected Categories of Employees 82

45. Number of Days Child Was Sick During the Previous Twelve Months, for Selected Categories of Children. 84

46. Number of Years Since Child Was Vaccinated for Smallpox, for Selected Categories of Children. 85

47. Smallpox Vaccination at School, for Selected Categories of Children. 85

48. Number of Years Since Child Was Vaccinated for Diphtheria, Whooping Cough, or Tetanus, for Selected Categories of Children 86

49. Diphtheria, Whooping Cough, or Tetanus Vaccination at School, for Selected Categories of Children. 87

Table Page

50. Number of Years Since Child Was Vaccinated for Polio, for Selected Categories of Children. 88

51. Polio Vaccination at School, for Selected Categories of Children 88

52. Number of Years Since Child Was Given a Skin Test for Tuberculosis, for Selected Categories of Children. 88

53. Skin Test for Tuberculosis Given at School, for Selected Categories of Children 89

54. Number of Years Since Child Was Vaccinated For Smallpox, Diphtheria, Whooping Cough, Tetanus, or Polio or Received Skin Test for Tuberculosis, for Selected Categories of Children 90

55. Number of Years Since Child's Teeth Were Examined by a Dentist, for Selected Categories of Children 91

56. Dental Examination Given at School, for Selected Categories of Children 91

57. Number of Years Since Child Was Examined by a Physician, for Selected Categories of Children. 92

58. Respondent's Family Receives as Much Medical Care as He Thinks Is Necessary, for Selected Categories of Children 93

59. Respondent's Family Would Obtain More Medical Care if It Were Less Expensive, for Selected Categories of Employees. . .93

60. Medical Costs are Considered a Serious Problem, for Selected Categories of Employees. 94

61. Number and Per cent of Children Not in School, by Class and Race 96

62. Mean Number of Total Days Absent from School and Mean Number of Days Absent Because of Migration, by Class and Race 99

63. Number of Total Days Absent from School, for Selected Categories of Children 101

64. Number of Total Days Absent from School Becuase of Migration, for Selected Categories of Children. 101

65. Grade Progress of Migrant White Children in School 103

Table Page

66. Grade Progress of Migrant Non-white Children in School . . . 103

67. Age-Grade Status of Migrant White Children in School, Age 7-18 105

68. Age-Grade Status of Migrant Non-white Children in school, Age 7-19 106

69. Mean Age-Grade Retardation of Children in School, by Age, for Selected Categories of Children 107

70. Highest Grade Completed, by Age, for Out-of-School Children 108

71. Mean Age-Grade Retardation of All Children, by Age, for Selected Categories of Children. 108

72. Highest Grade Desired by Parents for Child, for Selected Categories of Children 112

73. Parent Prefers that His Child "Go That Far" in School, Instead of Taking a Good-Paying Job, for Selected Categories of Children 113

74. Highest Grade Expected by Parent for Child, by Class and Race 115

75. Employee Would Advise His Children or Young Friends to Become Migrant Farm Laborers Permanently, by Class 120

76. Occupational Ambitions of Employee for Children Age Ten and Over, for Selected Categories of Children. 121

77. Employee Plans to Change to Some Other Type of Work in the Next Two Years, by Class 122

78. Employee Reasonably Well Satisfied With His Pattern of Life and Work, by Class. 123

79. Employee Expects to Return to Work in This Area Next Year, by Class 125

80. Likes Concerning Employment in Southern Illinois, for Selected Categories of Employees 126

81. Likes Concerning Employment on the Specific Farm, for Selected Categories of Employees 127

82. Dislikes Concerning Employment in Southern Illinois, for Selected Categories of Employees 129

Table Page

83. Dislikes Concerning Employment on the Specific Farm, for Selected Categories of Employees 129

84. How Employee Felt He Was Treated in the Community, by Selected Categories of Employees 131

85. What Employee Thought Community Residents Felt About Migrant Workers, by Selected Categories of Employees 132

86. Opinion of Employee Concerning Comparison of This Community With Others, by Selected Categories of Employees 132

87. How Farmers Obtained Migrant Workers, by Category of Farm. . 139

88. Youngest Age of Children "Employed," by Category of Farm . . 143

89. Number of Farmers Who Regarded Specified Percentages of Seasonal Workers as a Problem, by Type of Problem and Category of Farm 146

90. Per cent of Seasonal Workers Regarded as a Problem by the Farmers, by Type of Problem and Category of Farm 147

91. How Far the Farmer Considered It Desirable for the Brighter Children of Migrant Farm Workers to go in School, by Category of Farm 149

92. Did the Farmer Think That the Children of Migrant Farm Workers Have As Much Opportunity for a Good Education as Other Children, by Category of Farm?. 150

93. Opinion of the Farmer Toward Having Local School Rooms Made Available to Migrant Children During Summer Fruit and Vegetable Harvesting, by Category of Farm. 152

94. Statistical Differences Between White and Non-white Employees, for Selected Variables. 204

95. Statistical Differences Between Semi-Mobile and Mobile White Employees, for Selected Variables. 206

96. Estimated Total Number of Migrant Employees Who Worked in the 1958 Strawberry Harvest in the Sample Areas, and Number of Employees Interviewed, by Farm Size Category. 226

97. Estimated Number of Total and of Negro Migrant Adults, by Sex, and Children Who Worked on Union County Farms in 1957, by Weeks 229

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are approximately one million people in the United States who migrate in search of farm labor.[1] Analyses of the social problems arising from the migration of these people for the most part have not been intensive. These problems should be of interest to the general public and to sociologists in particular.

In 1956 the Committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers, a subdivision of the Illinois Commission on Children, requested that a survey be made of the extent of various problems associated with the use of migrant farm workers, particularly as they affect children and the education of children, in southern Illinois. The committee was rather familiar with the problem in northern Illinois, but suspected that the picture in southern Illinois was much different, as was found to be the case. This is a report of the research project which was instituted in response to that request.

Strawberries and peaches are the two crops whose harvest attracts most of the laborers who come to southern Illinois in search of seasonal farm employment. Most of the data presented are based upon interviews with strawberry pickers. Peach pickers were by-passed--except for some pilot study interviews--because children, particularly younger children, play a negligible role in the harvest of peaches as compared with the harvest of strawberries, and local schools are not in session while peaches are being picked.

---

[1] Ed Marciniak, Toward a National Policy for Migrant Labor (Chicago, 1960) p. 9. This estimate excludes children of the workers but includes Mexican nationals, 430,000 in 1959, imported under contract. Accurate data on how many residents of the United States migrate in search of farm work do not exist.

Fruit is important to the economy of southern Illinois and of other areas, and it is a vital part of a healthful diet. Because of avoidance of fruit picking by most residents, migrant laborers are essential for the commercial production of most fruits. These migrants are also important because they are citizens, and how they and their children fare affects, at least indirectly, the general population. Should most of the children of migrant workers, for example, through lack of education, or otherwise, fail to become reasonably productive members of our society, their cost to the rest of society may substantially exceed their contributions. According to our democratic and religious ideals, they are important because they are human beings and their children are considered to be entitled to various rights and opportunities.

This survey is concerned with important aspects of the life of these migrants, including family composition, income, mobility, living conditions, health, aspirations, plans, attitudes, and, above all, the education of the children.

The farmers who employ these migrants are not completely ignored, however, by this survey. They were very helpful in giving information concerning the migrants they employed, in giving their evaluation of the migrants, and in contributing to the success of the sampling procedure. Information about the farmers and from the farmers are presented in Chapter IX.

This report is intended to be objective and contains much detail because it is directed primarily to three categories of readers:

1. Those who engage in activities designed to improve the position of migrant farm laborers and their children. Most of these are leaders in either public or private organizations actively concerned with problems related to the employment of migrant farm workers.
2. Persons who may engage in migrant farm labor research.
3. Persons who may attempt to organize and summarize information on this subject obtained through various research projects and in other ways.

The special definitions used in this report which are most important for a clear understanding of the data presented are:

1. Employee--The term employee is used in this report to refer to all farm laborers who work for cash wages and deal directly with the farmer or the crew leader. Several members of a family may work in the fields, but the only one herein referred to as an employee is the head of the family. When referring to the sample cases, employee and migrant are used as synonyms for respondent.
2. Mobile--Migrants who were reported to have not remained in a "home" community throughout the nine months of the school year are referred to as mobile.
3. Semi-Mobile--Migrants who were reported to have been in a "home" community the nine consecutive months of the school year are referred to as semi-mobile. A few cases where the family left the community less than a week before the school term ended or where some but not

all members of the family remained until the last day of school were included in the semi-mobile rather than in the mobile category.

4. Non-white--Negroes constituted all but one case of the families who were classified as non-white. The one Spanish-speaking family was included with the Negro cases to form a minority-group category because both ethnic groups are treated differentially by many whites. Even though Spanish-speaking Americans are classed as whites by the United States Census Bureau and many demographers, the term non-white will be used in this report in place of minority-group because it is shorter and more convenient.

5. Home community--The community in which the migrant spent the most time during the year preceding the interview with him is referred to as the home community.

6. Class--The term class refers to categories described in "The Classification Used" section of Chapter III. It does not refer to social class.

7. School-age children--The expressions "school-age children" and "children of school age" are defined for the purposes of this report to include all children 6 to 19 years of age inclusive who were unmarried and still lived with their parents.

8. In-school children--"In-school children" or "children in school" refers to those children who were reported to have attended school at least part of the 1957-1958 school year, which immediately preceded the interviewing. "Out-of-school children" or "children not in school" refers to those who were not reported to have attended at all.

9. Single worker--Each employee who had neither a spouse nor a child normally living with him, whether or not the family member or members migrated with the employee, is called a single worker. It includes widowed, divorced, and separated persons, as well as those who had never been married. These workers constitute what is designated as Class IV employees in the tables presented.

Summarizing statements of specific segments of this report are presented at the end, not the beginning, of the sections to which they refer.

CHAPTER II

RELATED SURVEYS OF MIGRANT FARM LABORS

A great amount of literature has been published concerning the migrant farm labor problem. Most of the literature has been the result of efforts by federal departments, state committees, welfare and religious organizations. This chapter will be devoted to a brief synthesis of a small but select portion of that literature.

As early as 1935, the Children's Bureau made a study of conditions among families of sugar-beet laborers. Forty-one per cent, or about 388, of the 946 families interviewed were migratory. For the families interviewed it was found that:

(1) The median number of persons per family was 6.2.

(2) Of the 2,004 children between the ages of six and sixteen, 670 worked in the fields and over half of these 670 usually worked longer than eight hours.

(3) Two-thirds of the children of school age were enrolled in school.

(4) Those in school were generally retarded grade-wise.

(5) The median yearly money income for families was $435 in 1935.

(6) Housing was generally over-crowded.[1]

A year later the report of a farm labor survey in the Yakima

---

[1] Elizabeth S. Johnson, Welfare of Families of Sugar-beet Laborers (Children's Bureau Publication No. 247, Washington: 1939) pp. 14, 16, 24, 31-32, 42, 51-52, 67, 76.

Valley of Washington was published. Analyzing the social characteristics of the transient white farm laborers, it was found that:

(1) Fifty-five to sixty per cent were single.

(2) The median age of the family heads was 38 years.

(3) The median age of the single laborers was 41.

(4) Twenty-three per cent of the family heads and 26 per cent of the single workers had less than an eighth grade education.

(5) Over 23 per cent of the school children lost more than 4 weeks of school during the preceding school year.

(6) About half of the 252 migrants made only two moves during the preceding year.

(7) The median annual income for the single workers was $334, for the family heads, $297, and for the transient households, $357.[2]

Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona was the title of the report of a survey made early in 1938. Major findings for the sample of 518 respondents were:

(1) The largest group, called "part-year migrants," having spent most of the year at home, set out in search of agricultural employment in the fall of 1937. The remainder, called "full-year migrants," had been migrant workers since late 1936 or earlier.

(2) The only important difference in the backgrounds and recent history of the two groups was caused by the full-year migrants having left home a year earlier than the part-year migrants did.

---

[2] Paul H. Landis and Melvin S. Brooks, Farm Labor in Yakima Valley, Washington (State College of Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 343, Pullman: 1936) pp. 32-38, 43-44, 54-56.

(3) Most of the camps for migratory workers were unsanitary and crowded and had highly inadequate facilities. Health hazards were frequently serious.

(4) The migrant cotton pickers were disliked and considered undesirable by Arizona residents, who resented the mixing of migrant and resident children in school.

(5) Malnutrition was widespread among the children.

(6) Most of the migrants had been residents of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Missouri and were forced out by mechanization, drought, wind erosion, low farm prices, low farm wages, and other factors. Economic reasons for leaving home were given by 81 per cent of the part-year migrants.

(7) Extensive advertising campaigns by cotton growers attracted a large surplus of migrant workers to Arizona, creating serious problems.

(8) Families earned an average of ten dollars a week picking cotton in Arizona, which was less than the average reported in Texas and California and less than weekly earnings in other migratory jobs.

(9) The mean cash income during 1937 of the 518 household units, including unattached persons as well as families as household units, was $455, the means for full-year and part-year migrants being $557 and $439 respectively.

(10) Full-year migrants spent a mean of 23.5 weeks during 1937 at migratory cotton work, and part-year migrants spent a mean of 11.2 weeks.

(11) The migrants had surprisingly little unemployment during 1937, a mean of only 4.3 weeks. The mean amount for full-year migrants

was 5.2 weeks, and for part-year migrants it was 4.1.

(12) About two-thirds of the migratory employee units were families, with families being much more predominant among part-year than among full-year migrants.

(13) Only five per cent of the migrant workers were Negroes, few of whom had brought their children along and most of whom expected to return to their home communities. Only three of the 518 migrants in the study were Spanish-American.

(14) The median age of family heads was 37 and the median age of unattached persons was 29.

The report also contained an abridged version of the findings of a similar study in New Mexico, in which Johansen stated that child labor among migratory worker families in New Mexico in 1937 was common. In the 235 migratory-casual households in his sample, "almost 10 per cent of the persons 5-9 years of age, over 70 per cent of those 10-14, and nearly 85 per cent of those 15-19 worked some time during the year."[3]

A study by the Women's Bureau of migratory workers in Delaware canneries, reported in 1941, found that:

(1) Methods for obtaining work were very haphazard.

(2) Average annual earnings in 1939 were $189 for all wage earners.

(3) The average wage earner worked a total of 28½ weeks.[4]

---

[3] Malcolm Brown and Orin Cassmore, Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona (Division of Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington: 1939) pp. XIII, 2-9, 22-24, 27-30,89, 94-97.

[4] Arthur T. Sutherland, The Migratory Labor Problem in Delaware (Women's Bureau Bulletin No. 185, Washington: 1941) pp. 16-17, 19.

In 1943, the Children's Bureau published: The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas, which was based upon interviews with a sample of 342 families having one or more children age six to eighteen. It was found that:

(1) Employment was irregular and unstable.

(2) The median total cash income of families in 1942 was $350.

(3) Of the 998 children age six to eighteen, 69 per cent were employed in the working force.

(4) Of the 837 children age six to sixteen, not quite three-fifths were enrolled in school.

(5) Of these children enrolled in school, the proportions who were overage for their grades were:[5]

- (a) 66.5 per cent of those age six to nine,
- (b) 97.5 per cent of those age ten and eleven,
- (c) 94.6 per cent of those age twelve and thirteen,
- (d) 99.3 per cent of those age fourteen and fifteen,
- (e) 97.4 per cent of those age sixteen and seventeen.

(6) Health conditions were poor.

(7) Childhood mortality was high--fifteen per cent of the children born alive in the sample families died in infancy and an additional eight per cent died before the age of eighteen.[6]

---

[5] A child whose age was six was considered normal if in the first grade, a child age seven was normal if in the second grade, etc.

[6] Amber Arthun Warburton, The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas (Children's Bureau Publication No. 298, Washington: 1943) pp. 4-6, 12, 17, 20, 34, 48, 52-55, 65.

In 1949, the International Labor Office reported that in the United States, in comparison with the other wage and work systems in this country:

(1) The agricultural worker was underemployed.

(2) Agricultural wage systems were unstable and wages were substandard.

(3) Hours of work were irregular.

(4) Women and children were employed freely.

(5) The living conditions for migrant farm laborers were unsuitable.[7]

In 1951 the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture reported that:

(1) No large group of migrants has remained permanently migratory.

(2) Most people are not migrants by choice.

(3) They feel that they cannot make a living by staying in one place.

(4) They usually do not qualify to vote because they have no established residence.

(5) They neither claim a community as a home nor does a community claim them.

(6) They are underemployed.

(7) The labor-contractor system of employing laborers often results in overcharging workers for transportation, food, etc.

It was also stated that one of the reasons for employment insecurtiy among migrant farm laborers was the fact that there is little personal contact between the laborer and the employer. As a result, the typical laborers are not sure of employment on the farm in subsequent years. In addition, this study further documented the results of the earlier studies concerning child labor, interference with education, deplorable housing, and high death rates among the migrants.[8]

---

[7] Conditions of Employment of Agricultural Workers (Fourth Conference of American States Members of the International Labour Organisation, Report III, Geneva: International Labour Office, 1949) pp. 51, 61-66, 76, 97-99, 111-118, 127-130.

An outstanding recent field study, in which 665 families in four states were interviewed, was conducted by Greene and reported in 1954. It was found that only 78 per cent of the children age seven to fifteen years inclusive were enrolled in schools. For children age six to eighteen years inclusive, only 65 per cent were enrolled. "Working in agriculture" was the principle reason for non-enrollment. Of the children enrolled, two-thirds were average for their grade, but absenteeism was common. Of 197 school principals and teachers interviewed, 114 listed "absenteeism" as a problem, and 65 of the 114 listed it as a serious problem.

Half of the children had not completed one grade per year enrolled in school, almost two-thirds were overage for the grade they were in, and over 30 per cent were judged by their teachers to be in grades above what their scholastic attainment warranted.

It is interesting to note that the study revealed a desire on the part of 80 per cent of the migrant parents for their children to finish high school at least. However, according to the author, it was doubtful if their desires would be realized, since there was little evidence of change concerning the employment of the children.[9]

---

[8] Migratory Labor in American Agriculture (Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, Washington: 1951) pp. 1-5, 10-12, 89-92, 119-170.

Another study which was primarily concerned with the personal and social characteristics of migrant farm laborers was published in 1954. Using a total sample of 498 Atlantic Coast migrants of whom 360 were workers and 138 were non-workers, it was found that nearly two-thirds of the household members were between 18 and 44 years of age. Almost half of the workers were female. Not many of the children in the sample worked in the fields with their parents. About 89 per cent of the 138 non-workers were children under 16 years of age. Further, only two per cent of the workers were children age 10 to 13 and only five per cent of the workers were age 14 to 17.

Comparatively, the educational attainment of the migrants was low. The median highest grade completed by all workers over 25 years of age was 5.7. The comparative figure from the 1950 census for non-whites in New York State was 8.6.

Concerning the work history of the migrants, it was reported that the average number of locations at which workers were employed during the preceding year was 3.2. On the average, 151 days were spent in farm work and 56 days in non-farm work, a total of 207. In the 12 months preceding the survey, the average worker earned $1,220.[10]

---

[9] Shirley E. Greene, The Education of Migrant Children (Migrant Research Project Board, Washington: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1954) pp. 52-66, 68-73, 115-121.

[10] Joe R. Motheral, Howard E. Thomas, and Olaf F. Larson, Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream: Western New York, June 1953 (Department of Rural Sociology Mimeograph Bulletin No. 42, Ithaca: Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1954) pp. 8-10, 14-15, 18-19, 26-27.

A similar survey, in western Michigan, was reported in 1957. With a sample of 417, it was found that the median age of men was 43; that of women, 37. The mean number of years in migrancy was 3.4.

Unlike the New York survey of Atlantic Coast migrants previously cited, the Michigan survey put a great deal of emphasis on the education of the migrant children. One of the significant findings is that two out of five children, over 18 years of age, had not completed the elementary grades. Also, the "typical" migrant child in the survey lost 26 school days out of the school year (175 days). Further, 73 per cent of the adults felt that their children received "just about the right amount of schooling."[11]

A survey in Colorado by Rivera was reported in 1958. This essentially non-quantitative study was set up to test the hypothesis that there were "significant differential attitudes and practices regarding health and medical care related to differential family backgrounds or settings."

The two groups studied were the Spanish group and the Anglo group. It was found that the Spanish-speaking group was more interested in finding permanent employment than the Anglo group. The Spanish group also tended to migrate in larger related units. Often there were three or four large related families moving together. These units were called "kin-crews" by the author. The main decisions were handled symbiotically at this "kin-crew" level.

---

[11] Jerome G. Manis, A Study of Migrant Education (Center for Sociological Research, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo; 1958) pp. 8-11, 13-14, 16.

Further, the Spanish group tended to have larger families, their median being 5.2 persons and the Anglo median being 4.6. The median-sized family in the general population is 3.7. Generally, there seemed to be no differences between family medical experiences of the Anglo group and of the Spanish group.

Finally, in his summary, the author stresses the need for more well-planned studies about migrant family social characteristics. He feels that the migrant family should be studied as a unit and as a social system.[12]

---

[12] Julius Rivera, Selected Characteristics of Two Migrant Groups Visiting Colorado in 1957 (Denver: Colorado State Department of Public Health, 1958) pp. 3-6, 13.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND CLASSIFICATION

Because the Committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers requested a survey of migrant laborers in southern Illinois, members of that committee were polled as to the specific types of information they wanted. Their replies served as the major basis for deciding the subject-matter scope of the study. In addition, literature relating to migrant farm laborers was reviewed and unstructured interviews were held with persons familiar with commercial farm production involving migrant laborers in southern Illinois.

Interviews with Farmers

In order to develop feasible plans for interviewing the migrant workers, it was necessary to obtain information from farmers and secure their cooperation. Most migrant laborers live on the farms of their employers while working in southern Illinois. A schedule for interviewing farmers was constructed in the spring of 1957 and farmers in Union County were interviewed during the summer (Appendix A).

Union County was selected because it is the major county in southern Illinois in the production of crops which are largely harvested by migrants. Most of the counties in southern Illinois were omitted from this survey because both data from the United States Census and information from persons familiar with agriculture in this part of the state indicated that only a few of these counties were of more than negligible importance with respect to farm employment of migrants.

A list of the fruit growers in Union County who were known or believed to employ a substantial number of seasonal workers was compiled. Since there were only 17 names on this list, all were interviewed. To avoid missing the farmers who employed smaller numbers of migrants, the county was divided into sections of approximately one square mile, a 20 per cent random sample of these was taken, and then farms (exclusive of the 17 "large" farms) in these sample sections were visited. All farmers in these sections who stated that they employed or expected to employ any migrant workers in 1957 were interviewed with the "farmer" schedule. There were only 13. The schedule data obtained from these 30 farmers in Union County form the basis for estimates for the entire county (Appendix D, pp. 228-230) and in general confirm the information given by the source persons interviewed earlier.

The other major area in southern Illinois of farm employment of migrants is the area surrounding Centralia and Irvington. It extends up to about eight miles each side of U. S. Highway 51, with Ashley its southern boundary and a little north of Centralia its northern boundary. The overwhelmingly dominant farm task at which migrants work in this area is strawberry picking.

As it was not considered necessary to obtain data about other crops in the Centralia-Irvington area, strawberry growers were the only farmers interviewed in this area and they were not asked for information about their other crops. Farmers who planted less than three acres of strawberries were also omitted, because it was considered that their aggregate employment of migrants would be small. Thirty-three farmers in the area covered had three or more acres of strawberries and all were interviewed. They live in the contiguous corners of Washington, Jefferson, and Marion counties.

Interview with Migrant Farm Laborers

Interviewing of migrant peach pickers on a pilot study basis took place in Union County in August, 1957, peach picking being by far the dominant farm task in that county involving migrants. A schedule had been constructed which was pretested through these interviews.

A systematic random sampling procedure was attempted but broke down. Some of the farmers did not know the names of some of their employees. An unusually short harvest and other factors made possible only five days of interviewing. Intermittent rain frequently caused a halt to picking and many of the workers scattered shortly before the interviewers arrived at the farms for interviewing. Meager resources at that time caused the size of the interviewing staff to be too small. Consequently, although 84 interviews were conducted, single workers were heavily under-represented and it is possible, perhaps probable, that other important biases exist in this sample.

The main interviewing of migrant laborers took place during the strawberry harvest in the spring of 1958. The schedule (Appendix B) used was a revision and expansion, particularly in the amount of information pertaining to the education of the children, of the schedule used for interviewing the peach pickers the previous summer.

The sampling plan used to select the migrants for interviewing was basically the same as that attempted among peach pickers the previous summer. This time, however, it worked reasonably well.

On each sample farm, the farmer was asked to supply the names of all employees engaged in the strawberry harvest who did not reside in the county in which the farm was located, or an adjacent county, and did not commute between home and work.[1] A family unit was considered as one "employee" for sampling purposes, regardless of how many members worked. These names were listed in whatever order they were given and numbered consecutively. On all but one of the 17 "large" farms--those having 15 or more acres of strawberries in 1958--approximately 30 per cent of the employees listed were selected for interviewing.[2]

In the case of "small farms--those having at least three but less than 15 acres of strawberries in 1958--the plan was to choose a 50 per cent sample of the farms and interview 60 per cent of the employees on these sample small farms, thus obtaining approximately a 30 per cent sample of employees from the small farms as well as from the large farms. In the Centralia-Irvington area 8 of the 16 small farms were selected randomly. Approximately three out of every five employees on each of these sample small farms were chosen by the same general method as was employed on the large farms.

---

[1] Most of the farmers were able to give a complete or virtually complete list of names. On a few farms, chiefly in the Cobden area, the list of employees had to be obtained from crew leaders, if any, and from the employees themselves. On one large farm a list could not be obtained.

[2] Combinations of three non-consecutive numbers out of ten--such as 1-4-7-11-14-17 or 3-6-10-13-16-20--were chosen and assigned randomly to the large farms to avoid bias in either selecting or avoiding any particular number. Employees having the numbers chosen for that particular farm constituted the desired sample for that farm. On the farm for which a list of employees could not be compiled, every third worker who collected wages at the end of the day interviewers visited that farm (the general practice on that farm was to collect wages each evening) was interviewed. Only one farmer, who had 15 acres of strawberries, objected to having his employees interviewed. No names were obtained or employees interviewed on that farm.

In the Cobden area four out of six small farms were selected randomly. Even though four out of six is a higher proportion than the 8 out of 16 in the Centralia-Irvington area, the ratio of employees interviewed to the estimated total employees was only a little higher for the Cobden area small farms than for the average of all other farms because of two factors:

(1) In both areas employees selected for interviewing who could not be located were not replaced, except in three or four cases.

(2) Interviewers were unable to find as high a percentage of the small-farm employees selected for interviewing in the Cobden area as they did in the Centralia-Irvington area.

Interviewing of the migrant workers never began until after they had finished picking strawberries for the day, which ranged from around noon to four o'clock or later, varying greatly from farm to farm and from day to day. Interviewing continued until about eight o'clock or later unless interviews with all available employees in the designated sample for that farm were completed earlier. As a rule, return visits to farms were necessary because some of the employees, particularly single workers, frequently went to town after they were through picking. The number of interviewers who went to a farm depended primarily upon the number of employees in the sample for that farm.

Most of the interviewers were graduate students at Southern Illinois University majoring in sociology, in psychology, or in rehabilitation. All of them were specially instructed both orally and in writing.

The southern Illinois strawberry harvest in 1958 was unusually late and lasted only two weeks instead of the usual three weeks. This made it impossible to finish the interviewing until after some of the workers had quit picking and left the area.[3] It also was one of the reasons the sampling design was much less successful in the Cobden area than in the Centralia-Irvington area, in which interviewing was completed earlier.[4]

A total of 204 strawberry pickers in the two areas combined were interviewed. This constituted 25 per cent of the estimated total number of employees. Single workers were heavily underrepresented. Only 19 per cent of the single workers as compared with 29 per cent of the family employee units estimated to have been in the population sampled were interviewed (Appendix D). The 141 families interviewed are, however, considered to be representative of the total in the population--approximately as representative as a pure random sample

---

[3] In addition to migrants who left just before the completion of the harvest, a number left earlier--usually after working only a day or so. The latter are primarily "winos" and others who seldom if ever remain on one job for an appreciable length of time. They constitute a highly vexing problem for some growers. Without doubt, this category is underrepresented in the sample of employees interviewed.

[4] Other reasons the sampling plan worked less well in the Cobden area than in the Centralia - Irvington area were that the Cobden growers had more turnover in employees from year to year and employed a much higher proportion of single workers. Cobden growers hired more Negroes than whites, whereas Negroes worked on only one farm in the Centralia-Irvington sample.

Validation Through School Records

The problem of accuracy of responses is inherent in a questionnaire study. It was assumed that, except possibly for a few subjective attitude questions, the data obtained which were likely to be the most inaccurate were those pertaining to school attendance because many migrant laborers violate child labor laws. It is illegal to permit one's children of compulsory school age to work out of school during school hours or to employ children of compulsory school age during school hours.

To determine the quality of the data migrant laborer parents gave concerning the education of their children, questionnaires were mailed to the superintendents or principals of the schools which the parents stated their children had attended (Appendix C). A follow-up request was sent to those who did not reply the first time. Questionnaires pertaining to three-fourths of the 228 children reported by their parents as having attended school that year were received, but one-fourth of those received indicated that no school record of the child for that year was found.[5] The attendance and other school information given by the migrant parents was found to be substantially accurate for 109, nearly two-thirds, of the 170 children for which some kind of reply was received from school authorities. Substantially inaccurate information was given for 15 per cent of the children for which school authorities found school records. If it may be assumed that a majority of the children reported by their parents to have attended school in 1957-1958 but for whom school authorities reported they could find no record, actually had not attended,[6] perhaps false information on school attendance was given by a fourth or more of the migrant laborers. This would indicate that unverified data on school attendance based on replies from migrant laborers should not be taken at face value.

---

[5] Several communities in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas were visited by the authors in July, 1958, to obtain the school questionnaire data. Class enrollment record books were examined and the findings were combined with the data from the questionnaires returned by mail.

Analysis Procedure

In general the migrant laborer families were characterized by little formal education, low income, and a few associated attributes. The interviewing staff was much more impressed, however, by the heterogeneity among these migrants. It was obvious that they varied widely in many important respects.

---

[6] This appears to be a resonable assumption even though failure of school authorities to find records for these children could be caused by other factors, including: (1) interviewers having failed to obtain from the parent the correct name of the school, whether due to poor memory and guessing by the parent, misunderstanding, or failure of the interviewer to ask that question, and (2) failure of the school authorities to find records for children who had attended their schools. The last reason probably accounted for very few cases. If the teacher's record book for the appropriate class was not found, it seems likely that the school authority would merely not reply, rather than write that the school had no record pertaining to the child.

An important step in understanding any phenomenon or social problem is objective, adequate classification, including description of the types or categories. Previous migrant farm labor research projects apparently have not tried to determine whether or not there are types of migrant farm laborers.[7] If there are types, they should be identified and described. A program which would produce desired results with one type might be inappropriate and fail when applied to a much different type.

The search for types

To put data obtained from the interviews into useable form, the data were grouped into general areas, e.g., all variables pertaining to mobility were grouped into one category, all variables pertaining to occupational history were grouped into another category, etc.

After this was done, specific variables were selected for use in constructing the index values of the general areas. Three bases were used in selecting these variables. The first was assumed intrinsic importance or relevance. The second was quality of information obtained. There is more confidence concerning the reliability and validity of the variables selected than of most of the other quantitative data. The third was the type of measurement--only variables for which the data met the requirements of an interval scale or of a ratio scale were selected. The third basis eliminated no variables which rated well on the first two bases. Following this, five "general" variables were selected as feasible to use in attempting to classify the farm laborer families into types:

---

[7] A type is a category all members of which share a cluster of attributes or similar characteristics which tend to distinguish these persons from others or other types.

(1) Number of persons in family.
(2) Migrational history.
(3) Total number of days worked by family head in last twelve months.
(4) Average age of family head and his wife.
(5) Average highest grade completed by family head and his wife.

The values for the second "general" variable, migrational history, were computed from values of specific variables within that category:

(1) Number of localities in last twelve months.
(2) Longest number of consecutive weeks in home community in last twelve months.
(3) Number of consecutive years migrated to same areas.
(4) Number of consecutive years in migrant farm labor.
(5) Total number of years in migrant farm labor.

Intercorrelations among pairs of these five specific variables were estimated by scatter diagrams--crossplotting. Only the first two variables showed any appreciable correlation. This was a negative correlation of -.72. The other three variables were discarded for purposes of classification because of low correlation.

Because of the negative correlation between number of localities and number of consecutive weeks in the home community, the second variable was changed to read: number of weeks not consecutively spent in home community. This made the correlation a positive one. After this was done, the values for these two specific variables were converted to standard scores which were then averaged to obtain the values for the general variable, "migrational history."

Intercorrelations among all pairs of the five general variables and correlations between each general variable and the specific variables in the other four categories were then estimated by crossplotting. In case of coubt that the correlation was very low and not significant, a Pearsonian coefficient of correlation was calculated. No correlation as high as .20 was found.

These clear-cut negative results forced abandonment of the search for types among the migrants who came to southern Illinois to pick strawberries. The reasons for this are obvious. If variables are used for typing which are not at least moderately correlated, either or both of two possible consequences would be inevitable: (1) the resulting number of type categories would be large, with very small numbers of cases in most of the categories, or (2) highly heterogeneous categories would emerge.

The classification used

An alternative method of classification of the migrants was needed. Since the effect of migration on the education of children is a major aspect of the study being reported, migration or "mobility" was selected as one major basis for determining the classificatory categories. Another was the presence or absence of school-age children and whether the migrant was unattached or living as a member of a family. The other basis for classification was the apparent accuracy of the data obtained through the interviews with the migrants. It appeared desirable to separate the cases in which school attendance data had been verified from those in which it had not, even though the latter undoubtedly included some cases of reasonably accurate data.

Using these criteria, six classes were formed.

Class Ia includes families with children of school age who were reported to have been in the home community the nine months of the school year. Also, the information received from the school officials generally coincided with the information received from the migrants.

Class Ib as well as Class Ia includes families with children of school age who were reported to have been in the home community the nine consecutive months during the school year. However, one of three things caused the data received from the interviews with the migrants to be questioned. Either it did not coincide with the information received from the schools, or the school officials found no record for the child, or he failed to respond to the questionnaire.

Class IIa includes families with children of school age who spent less than the nine months of the school year in their home communities. As in the case of Class Ia, the information received from the schools generally coincided with the information received from the migrants.

Class IIb, like Class IIa, includes families with children of school age who were reported to have been in the "home" community less than the nine consecutive months of the school year. However, as in the case of Class Ib, one of the conditions previously stated caused the information received from the migrants to be questioned.

Class I*a* and Class I*b* are actually subclasses of a category which is referred to as "semi-mobile." Likewise Class II*a* and Class II*b* are subclasses of a category which is referred to as "mobile." The subclasses will, however, be called "classes" as a matter of convenience.

Class III consists of those families having no children of school age--6 to 19 years inclusive.

Class IV includes all of the single employees--workers who at the time had neither a spouse nor any children who had not left their parental home.

One more major basis of classification was used. Each of the classes was divided into white and non-white cases. The only Latin-American or "Mexican" family was placed in the non-white category (which could more properly be called *minority-group*), partly to avoid bias in comparisons between classes of whites. There were too few "non-whites" to justify interclass comparisons for them.

The class distribution by race of the migrant employees and the comparable distribution for children of school age who are in the families of these employees appear in Table 1.[8]

Plan of Presentation

The two major comparisons made in analyzing the data obtained are between whites and non-whites and between semi-mobile and mobile

---

8. Two of the 204 schedules obtained were discarded because there was inadequate information for determining class and the quality of the information obtained was considered poor.

Table 1.--NUMBER OF MIGRANT EMPLOYEES AND SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, BY CLASS AND RACE

(See pages 3 and 4 for definitions of terms used in this and subsequent tables)

Class	Employees			School-age Children		
	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	275	224	51
Ia	21	18	3	72	59	13
Ib	25	17	8	73	55	18
IIa	13	13	0	37	37	0
IIb	31	26	5	93	73	20
III	48	31	17	--	--	--
IV	64	30	34	--	--	--

white families having children of school age. Unless it appeared obvious that the difference between two means, for example, was either highly significant or not significant, the difference was tested statistically.[9]

---

[9] An unknown margin of error is involved in these tests of significance because the tests are based upon assumptions or conditions which are not fully met by the data. For one thing, the samples compared were not completely random samples. The sampling design theoretically should have resulted in data slightly more representative than pure random samples would normally be, producing standard errors slightly smaller. This is not serious. Possible bias could have been introduced, however, by cases missed which were in the original sample.

The most appropriate parametric tests of significance between means were used. When serious lack of normality or of equality of distributions was observed, either the Chi-square or Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test of significance, which are nonparametric and more legitimate for such cases, were also used and given precedence in interpretation. These nonparametric techniques test the difference between entire distributions instead of the difference between means.

The final sample of 202 cases was from a limited universe roughly four times as large--the migrant employees of the farmers in the areas covered who were interviewed. Even where significant differences were found, generalizations beyond this universe are not warranted, except as hypotheses to be tested by samples from broader populations of migrant laborers. Many differences found between whites and non-whites or between semi-mobile and mobile migrants may well also exist, in

As a rule, the discussion of the data for each variable will include comparisons between whites and non-whites and between semi-mobile and mobile whites in that order.[10] Statistical tests of significance of difference were made for nearly all of the variables listed in Tables 94 and 95. All of these differences which are not mentioned in the text were not statistically significant and were relatively small. Comparisons are made between the data of this study and comparable data of other studies, but most of the comparisons are not exact because of the frequent use of medians in other studies.

Because the data for Classes Ia and IIa are of superior quality for at least some variables to the data for Classes Ib and IIb, when

---

different degrees, for east coast or for west coast migrant laborers, for example, but the present study cannot determine this. Formulas for sampling from unlimited rather than from finite universes were used in testing for significance, because this produces more conservative results, as well as being conventional.

Probably the most serious limitation in the testing for significant differences is that, when many tests are made (as was done), some differences can be expected to exceed the computed five per cent level of probability by chance. In other words, the true level of significance may be far different from the computed level. For this and other reasons, the results of the tests for significance should not be taken at face value. They are presented, nevertheless, because many persons wish them to be given under the conditions which prevail here, and to make their own interpretations in context.

The writers recommend that far more attention be given to the size of the differences found than to the tests of significance. Some of the differences are very large and almost certainly not due to chance errors of sampling or any other type of error. They indicate at least substantial differences in the parent universe.

[10] Because of the special interest in the education of children, only those families which had children of school age were included in the comparisons between semi-mobile whites and mobile whites. Single employees and families having no children of school age were excluded from most of the analysis of the data obtained. The children in the Class III families are excluded from all tables except those on household size.

a difference between semi-mobile and mobile whites was tested, a corresponding test was made between Classes Ia and IIa whites. When one of these tests was significant and the other not significant, this is pointed out even though the discrepancy may not be considered important. When both were significant or both non-significant, it was not considered necessary to specify that both tests turned out the same way, and as a rule no mention is made of the comparison between Classes Ia and IIa. The semi-mobile versus mobile comparison is generally favored over the Class Ia versus Class IIa comparison because the latter involves smaller numbers of cases and also a far greater possibility of non-random bias.

The size of the various classes varies, usually only slightly, from table to table. This is because cases have been omitted from tables presenting means when satisfactory answers were not obtained--whether due to the respondents not knowing the answer or due to failure of the interviewer to obtain the information for some other reason. When information was missing for a substantial number of cases, as was true for questions on income, this is indicated.

Many means are presented, particularly to facilitate comparisons between distributions of values for variables. In the non-tabular presentation, standard deviations will be presented in parentheses immediately following many of the means. The relatively large size of many of the standard deviations should be noted even when they are not specifically pointed out. Large standard deviations indicate lack of concentration around the means and relatively little usefulness of these means.

CHAPTER IV

FAMILY COMPOSITION

That the typical migrant agricultural worker is not well educated is widely known. Most people are not well-informed, however, concerning the size of the families of migrants.

Household Size

Whereas there were no children in 18 of the 108 white families, 14 of the 33 non-white families had no children. As a result the mean size of the white families was 5.1 as compared with only 4.2 for the non-whites (Table 2). Related to these differences is the fact that most non-whites came as members of crews and very few whites did. There was almost no net difference in mean size of the semi-mobile and mobile white families. Combined, their mean size was 5.8 and large families

Table 2.--MEAN FAMILY SIZE, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Families		Non-white Families	
	Number	Mean Size	Number	Mean Size
Total	105	5.1	33	4.2
Ia	18	5.5	3	7.0
Ib	17	6.2	8	4.4
IIa	13	5.8	0	---
IIb	26	6.0	5	7.8
III	31	3.2	17	2.5

were not uncommon, 23 per cent having eight or more members.

The average size of migrant laborer families was larger in some of the previous studies. Warburton[1] reported an average household size of 6.6 persons and Johnson[2] reported the median number of persons per family in her study was 6.2. In his study covering several states, Greene found an average of 6.1 persons per migrant household.[3] In two recent studies, Manis[4] reported a mean of nearly 4.6 children per married respondent among migrants in Van Buren County, Michigan, and Rivera[5] reported that his Anglo group had a median family size of 4.6 while the median for the Spanish group was 5.2.

Characteristics of Family Heads and of Their Wives

Four characteristics--sex, marital status, age, and education--of the heads of the migrant families, and of the wives of those who were married, will be presented. These factors, along with size of household, should give a fair picture of the family setting in which the migrant children are reared.

Sex and marital status

Five of the 105 white families and 4 of the 33 non-white families were broken. The family head in eight of these nine families was a woman, three being widows. The 129 families which were unbroken contained 12 whites and 4 non-whites who had been married at least once before.

---

[1] Warburton, The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas, p. 10.

[2] Johnson, Welfare of Families of Sugar-Beet Laborers, p. 16.

[3] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, p. 50.

[4] Manis, A Study of Migrant Education, p. 7

[5] Rivera, Selected Characteristics of Two Migrant Groups Visiting Colorado in 1957, p. 6.

Nearly half of the employees who had no immediate families and are herein defined as single workers, as described on page five, had been married. Of the 30 single whites, five were divorced, three separated, and two widowed. Of the 34 single non-whites, four were divorced, four separated, and eight widowed. It is reasonable to assume that the proportion of single workers who had once been married was at least as high among the single employees in the sample of cases to be interviewed who could not be located for interviewing as among those who were interviewed. A relatively high proportion, therefore, of the migrant workers who came to southern Illinois to pick strawberries, had experienced broken marriages.

Only three single whites were females, one of them being a widow. In contrast, six of the seven single non-white females were either divorced, widowed, or separated.

Age

White employees were slightly younger than the non-white, the respective mean ages being 39.7 and 41.5 (Table 3). There was not much concentration in any 10-year age group in either racial category. Likewise, mobile whites were slightly older than semi-mobile whites, 44.2 and 42.9 being their respective mean ages. The older age of the latter two categories, in which there are school-age children, is due to the absence of any family heads under 25 years of age. Roughly 30 per cent

Table 3.--MEAN AGE OF EMPLOYEE, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Age	Number	Mean Age
Total	135	39.7	67	41.5
I*a*	18	45.7	3	58.0
I*b*	17	42.7	8	34.4
II*a*	13	43.1	0	----
II*b*	26	42.8	5	39.4
III	31	35.7	17	39.3
IV	30	34.3	34	43.1

of both Class III (the heads of families having no school-age children) and Class IV (the single migrants), on the other hand, were under 25 years of age.

Other research projects revealed similar average ages of heads of migrant families. The median age of the fathers in Greene's study was 40-44 years,[6] and the median in Manis's was 42.6.[7] In the study by Landis and Brooks the median ages of family heads and of single laborers were 38 and 41 respectively,[8] and in the study by Brown and Cassmore the comparable medians were 37 and 29 respectively.[9]

Although the non-white respondents were older than the white, the non-white wives were younger than the white wives. The mean ages for these two groups of wives were 35.4 and 36.3 years (Table 4). The mean age of women in the Manis study was only slightly higher, 37.1.[10]

---

[6] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, p. 49.

[7] Manis, A Study of Migrant Education, p. 8.

[8] Landis and Brooks, Farm Labor in the Yakima Valley, Washington, pp. 34-36.

[9] Brown and Cassmore, Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona, p. 95.

[10] Manis, op. cit., p. 8.

Table 4.--MEAN AGE OF WIFE, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Wives		Non-white Wives	
	Number	Mean Age	Number	Mean Age
Total	100	36.3	29	35.4
I*a*	16	42.2	1	50.0
I*b*	17	36.9	6	33.0
II*a*	12	38.4	0	----
II*b*	25	37.3	5	33.8
III	30	31.3	17	35.8

Education

Low educational attainment characterized the migrant laborer respondents. The mean highest grade completed was 6.5 (S=3.1)[11] for whites and 5.6 (S=3.1) for non-whites (Table 5). Using the Critical Ratio procedure for testing the difference between two means, it was found that the difference was not quite statistically significant.[12] Nevertheless, the fact that non-whites in the general population are more poorly educated on the average than whites, supports an inclination to conclude that the non-white laborers who came to southern Illinois are less educated than the white migrants. Eight per cent of the whites and 10 per cent of the non-whites had not even finished the first grade. At least a half of both racial categories said they had completed five but less than nine grades. Nine per cent of the whites and five per cent of the non-whites had completed at least the junior year of high

---

[11] "S" is used in this report as the symbol for standard deviation.

[12] When the probability that a difference may be due to random errors of sampling is between five and one per cent, the difference is called *significant*; when the probability is less that one per cent, it is called *highly significant*. The terms significant and highly significant are used *only* with these statistical meanings in this report.

Table 5.--MEAN HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED BY EMPLOYEE, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Grade Completed	Number	Mean Grade Completed
Total	133	6.6	64	5.6
Ia	18	5.5	1	2.0
Ib	16	6.6	7	5.1
IIa	13	6.7	0	---
IIb	26	5.6	5	5.2
III	31	6.7	11	5.8
IV	29	7.5	34	6.0

school. One respondent, a white, had finished one year of college.

The mean highest grade completed for both the semi-mobile and the mobile white respondents was about six years (Table 95). The Class III and Class IV means were higher, being 6.7 and 7.5 respectively. For the non-whites, likewise, the Class III and Class IV respondents had progressed furthest in school. The trend toward staying in school longer might account in part for the better education of the Class III and Class IV respondents, who are younger on the average than the others.

Motheral, Thomas, and Larson reported even lower educational attainment among their respondents, all of whom were Negroes. The median grade completed by males 25 years of age was only 4.9.[13] Manis reported that the migrant fathers in his study had a median last grade completed of 6.2, in line with the findings of the present study.[14]

---

13. Motheral, Thomas, and Larson, Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream, p. 10.

14. Manis, *A Study of Migrant Education*, p. 9.

The wives in general were not as poorly educated as their husbands. The mean highest grade completed was 7.1 (S=2.7) by the white wives and 6.9 (S=3.3) by the non-white wives (Table 6). Only three per cent of the white and none of the non-white wives had failed to complete at least the first grade.

Table 6.--MEAN HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED BY WIFE, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Wives		Non-white Wives	
	Number	Mean Grade Completed	Number	Mean Grade Completed
Total	99	7.1	28	6.9
Ia	15	6.5	1	4.0
Ib	17	7.1	6	7.3
IIa	12	8.5	0	---
IIb	24	6.7	4	6.3
III	30	7.0	17	7.1

The difference between semi-mobile and mobile wives in highest grade completed, the respective means being 6.8 (S=2.2) and 7.3 (S=1.9), is not significant (Table 9).[15]

An examination of available literature on migrant farm workers indicates that the migrant farm laborers included in this study do not differ greatly from migrant farm laborers in general in respect to household size, marital status, sex, age, and education. They differ more from the general labor force in being less well educated and in marital status than in any of the other of these characteristics.

---

[15] A significant difference in highest grade completed by wives was found between Class Ia and Class IIa whites, but was rejected as being spurious because it is based on relatively few cases and is inconsistent with the difference between the means for the semi-mobile and mobile white wives.

CHAPTER V

MIGRATION AND OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY[1]

The three principal factors which contribute to the hardships and problems experienced by migrant agricultural laborers are their mobility, the lack of certainty and of continuity of employment, and low rates of pay. Migrant farm workers constitute probably the largest occupational category of lower class manual workers in the United States who move two or more times a year to obtain employment.

Mobility

Consecutive weeks spent in home community

The 202 migrant farm labor employees on the average spent almost one-third of their time away from their home communities (Table 7). There was almost no net difference between the whites and non-whites in this respect (Table 94). Since this factor was the basis used to separate the mobile from the semi-mobile cases, there was naturally a large difference between these two categories in the number of consecutive weeks spent in the home communities and this difference was not tested for statistical significance. The semi-mobile whites remained

---

[1] Most of the data presented in this and subsequent chapters pertain to the 12-month period immediately preceding the date each employee was interviewed. All exceptions will either be obvious or explicitly stated.

Table 7.--MEAN NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS EMPLOYEE SPENT IN HOME COMMUNITY IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Weeks	Number	Mean Number of Weeks
Total	133	34.3	66	33.8
I*a*	18	43.3	3	32.2
I*b*	17	45.0	8	40.5
II*a*	13	25.0	0	----
II*b*	36	28.4	5	22.0
III	30	30.7	17	30.3
IV	29	35.8	33	35.9

in one community an average of 44 (S=8.0) weeks, whereas the mobile whites remained a mean of only 27 (S=4.3) weeks--only slightly over half a year. One third of the mobile whites remained only 18 to 24 weeks (Table 8). The few cases which appear to be misclassified are families in which the migration history of the family head and of some or all of the children was different. Data for the entire family was used in classifying into mobility groups. As a general rule, white

Table 8.--NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS EMPLOYEE SPENT IN HOME COMMUNITY IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

(Data for semi-mobile and mobile white categories do not include Class III or Class IV cases in this or *any* subsequent table)

Number of Weeks	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
11-17	14	6	0	6	2	0
18-24	23	13	1	13	5	4
25-31	22	16	1	8	5	12
32-38	21	7	7	6	4	5
39-45	16	5	6	5	4	2
46-52	37	19	20	1	9	10
Incomplete information	2	1	0	0	1	1

migrant families did not split up--when the family head moved the rest of the family went along.

This survey's sample of migrant farm workers may be more mobile than the average for the United States. Warburton found 38½ weeks to be the median number of consecutive weeks spent in the home community by a sample of agricultural laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas, in 1941.[2]

Number of Localities

The mean number of localities in which the whites reported having worked during the previous twelve-month period was 4.3 (S=1.7) while the non-whites reported a mean of 3.9 (S=2.0), a non-significant difference (Tables 9 and 94). Other studies reported less mobility. Motheral, Thomas, and Larson stated that their group of Atlantic Coast migrants reported an average of 3.2 locations[3] and the mean for the Greene sample was also 3.2.[4]

The mean for the semi-mobile whites was 3.5 (S=0.4) whereas the mean for the mobile whites was 5.2 (S=1.8) (Table 95). The difference between the two distributions is highly significant. Twelve semi-mobile as compared with only one mobile white family had worked in no other areas than their home communities and southern Illinois and no semi-mobile as compared with five mobile cases had worked in over seven localities (Table 10).

---

[2] Warburton, The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas, p. 12.

[3] Motheral, Thomas, and Larson, Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream, p. 15.

[4] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, p. 69.

Table 9.--MEAN NUMBER OF LOCALITIES IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE OF EMPLOYEE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Localities	Number	Mean Number of Localities
Total	134	4.3	66	3.9
Ia	18	3.6	3	4.0
Ib	17	3.4	8	3.8
IIa	13	5.8	0	---
IIb	26	4.9	5	5.8
III	30	4.6	17	4.4
IV	30	4.0	33	3.6

Table 10.--NUMBER OF LOCALITIES IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Number of Localities	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-White	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
2	20	14	12	1	4	5
3	30	19	7	6	9	13
4-5	53	26	12	17	13	14
6-7	24	2	4	10	4	1
8-9	6	4	0	4	0	0
10	1	1	0	1	0	0
Incomplete information	1	1	0	0	0	1

Number of states

Both whites and non-whites had worked in an average of about three states during the preceding year (Tables 11 and 94). As would be expected, the semi-mobile whites had worked in fewer states (including their home states) than had mobile whites. The respective means were 2.6 (S=0.6) and 3.7 (S=1.0) (Table 95). Using the approximate t-test, it was found that this difference was significant.

Table 11.--NUMBER OF STATES IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Number of States	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-Mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
2	41	27	20	3	12	11
3	48	21	11	14	11	14
4	32	14	3	16	4	9
5	11	4	1	4	3	0
6	3	1	0	2	0	0

It is worth noting that about one-third of the 202 employees and over half of the semi-mobile white families had worked only in their home communities and in southern Illinois during the preceding year. For most of these cases, either this was their first venture as migrant farm laborers or else southern Illinois was generally the only area to which they migrated for employment.

Home states of migrants[5]

Seventeen home states were represented in the sample, two more than the 15 states of residence reported in a study by Sutherland.[6] Well over half of the white migrants came from Arkansas and over a third of the remainder from Missouri (Table 12). For the non-whites Louisiana equalled Missouri as a major home state and Mississippi ranked next. It is surprising that no migrants came from the contiguous state of

---

[5] As mentioned previously, the state in which a migrant spent a plurality of the preceding year was arbitrarily used as the definition of home state. Three migrants who insisted they had no home, however, were classified as not having a home state.

[6] Sutherland, The Migratory Labor Problem in Delaware, p. 13.

Table 12.--HOME STATE, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

State	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
Alabama	3	1	0	2	0	1
Arkansas	78	2	25	20	19	0
California	1	0	0	0	1	0
Florida	6	0	0	4	2	0
Illinois	3	7	1	1	0	3
Indiana	2	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	3	21	1	1	1	12
Michigan	3	1	0	0	1	1
Mississippi	2	10	1	1	0	7
Missouri	20	21	5	6	2	10
Ohio	2	0	1	0	1	0
Oklahoma	4	0	0	2	0	0
Oregon	1	0	0	1	0	0
Pennsylvania	1	0	0	0	1	0
South Carolina	0	1	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	1	1	0	0	1	0
Texas	3	1	1	1	0	0
No home	2	1	0	0	1	0

Kentucky and only two non-whites came from Arkansas. Most of the non-whites came as members of crews.

Work Obtained

Days of work obtained

The 153 reporting migrant laborers obtained a mean of 159 days of work during the twelve months prior to the interviewing. Whites obtained 19 more days of work than non-whites did and semi-mobile whites obtained 39 more days of work than mobile whites did (Tables 13, 94, and 95).[7]

---

[7] These and other calculations presented cover only cases for

Table 13.--MEAN TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Days	Number	Mean Number of Days
Total	108	165	45	146
Ia	17	198	3	93
Ib	11	209	2	160
IIa	12	161	0	---
IIb	22	165	3	175
III	23	171	12	140
IV	23	115	25	150

The most striking feature of data on total days of work, however, is not any difference between classes or categories of employees but the lack of central tendency for any class or category of employees or for any combination of classes or categories. Classifying total days of work into intervals of 50 days results in a fairly even distribution of frequencies, although not as uniform as classification into intervals of 100 days. At least 31 per cent of the employees fell in each class interval of 100 days (Table 14). Thus the migrant farm laborers who came to southern Illinois to pick strawberries in

---

which adequate data were obtained. Adequate is used here to refer to completeness of information on the items under consideration, not to accuracy of information, which is not known.

Parametric tests of significance were not used in this section because none would have been valid. According to the Chi-square test on data for total days of work obtained, the difference between whites and non-whites was not quite significant and the difference between semi-mobile and mobile whites was also not significant. Even this test is not valid for these data, however, because of (1) reasons given in footnote 9 on page 29, (2) the large number, 49, of cases for which data were incomplete, and (3) probable inaccuracy of some of the information obtained.

Table 14.--TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of Days	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1-50	17	7	2	4	8	4
51-100	13	11	3	6	3	5
101-150	26	5	5	8	4	3
151-200	9	9	2	3	3	6
201-250	19	7	6	6	3	4
251 & over	24	6	10	7	2	3
Incomplete information	27	22	7	5	7	9

1958 were almost as heterogeneous as possible in respect to total days of work obtained.

The total amount of *farm* work obtained by the respondents was limited. This is because a large majority of it is harvesting and the duration of the harvest of most crops, particularly fruits, is brief. Whites worked a mean of 89 (S=80) days and non-whites a mean of 100 (s=102) days (Tables 15 and 94). These means conceal far more than

Table 15.--MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED AS FARM LABORER IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Days Employed	Number	Mean Number of Days Employed
Total	119	89	54	100
I*a*	16	70	3	31
I*b*	16	42	4	58
II*a*	13	101	0	---
II*b*	22	125	5	109
III	27	92	15	100
IV	25	93	27	115

they reveal, however, because both series are far from normally distributed. Two-fifths of the whites and nearly as high a proportion of the Negroes performed less than 51 days of farm work during the year preceding the interviewing and 13 per cent and 15 per cent respectively reported over 200 days of farm work, including work on their own farms by a few part-time farmers. (Table 16).

Table 16.--NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED AS FARM LABORER IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of Days	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1-50	49	19	20	9	11	8
51-100	25	13	7	9	3	6
101-150	21	6	2	6	5	3
151-200	8	8	0	5	2	6
201-250	12	5	2	5	3	2
251 & over	4	3	1	1	1	2
Incomplete information	16	13	3	4	5	7

A major difference, highly significant statistically, between mobile and semi-mobile whites was found for this variable. The heads of mobile white families obtained a mean of 116 (S=76) days of farm work, whereas the mean for the semi-mobile heads was only 56 (S=75) (Table 95). Nearly two-thirds of the semi-mobile whites worked on farms less than 51 days as compared with barely over one-fourth of the mobile whites. Clearly, mobility is positively related to amount of farm work obtained. In general, in order to get much farm work, these laborers had to move to find it.

Contrasting results were found for non-farm work. Whites obtained over twice as much non-farm work as non-whites, their respective means being 69 (S=103) and 29 days (S=70) (Tables 17 and 94).[8] Similarly, semi-mobile whites obtained over three times as much non-farm work as mobile whites, their respective means being 138 (S=134) and 42 days (S=74) (Table 95). Not quite two-thirds of the whites obtained fewer than 51 days of non-farm work, whereas slightly over three-fourths of the non-whites obtained fewer than 51 days. Almost twice the proportion of mobile as of semi-mobile whites, 76 per cent and 40 per cent respectively, worked fewer than 51 days at non-farm labor (Table 18). The difference in days of non-farm work between

Table 17.--MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED AS NON-FARM LABORER IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Days Employed	Number	Mean Number of Days Employed
Total	119	69	54	29
Ia	18	124	3	51
Ib	12	158	5	75
IIa	12	55	0	--
IIb	25	35	3	0
III	26	76	14	20
IV	26	22	29	29

---

[8] Ten migrants gave complete information on farm work and incomplete information on non-farm work and ten other cases did vice versa. Hence, although the number of reporting cases is the same in Table 17 as in Table 15, not all cases are the same. As a result, Table 13 had to be based on fewer cases than Tables 17 and 15 and there are minor discrepancies among these tables.

whites and non-whites is almost significant, and the difference between the semi-mobile and mobile whites is highly significant.

Table 18.--NUMBER OF DAYS EMPLOYEE WORKED AS NON-FARM LABORER IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of Days	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
0-50	77	44	12	28	23	24
51-100	8	3	3	2	1	1
101-150	11	3	2	4	1	2
151-200	8	1	3	1	0	0
201-250	4	1	2	0	0	1
251 & over	11	2	8	2	1	1
Incomplete information	16	13	5	2	4	5

Nearly all of the migrants obtained all, or the bulk, of their work either in farm or in non-farm employment. Very few obtained even approximately the same amount of work in one as in the other type. Only four semi-mobile and five mobile respondents reported as much as 51 days of farm work in addition to 51 or more days of non-farm work. Eight semi-mobile employees claimed to have worked 300 or more days at non-farm work and only a few days at farm work. These, plus a few additional semi-mobile respondents, were basically non-agriucltural workers to whom seasonal farm work was only incidental, providing a small supplement to their non-farm income. Narrow definitions of migrant farm workers would exclude these cases. Their omission would reduce both the average number of days worked and the average income of the semi-mobile employees.

Only 2 of 34 mobile whites reported over 250 days of non-farm work. Six reported over 200 days of agricultural work. Approximately half of the mobile whites and a third of the semi-mobile whites had not obtained any non-farm work during the year.

Considering both the amount and the type of work (farm versus non-farm), then, it is obvious that workers who migrated to southern Illinois in 1958 to pick strawberries were extremely heterogeneous.

Number of farm and non-farm jobs

Whites and non-whites obtained about the same number of farm jobs, their means being 4.0 (S=2.7) and 4.3 (S=4.3) respectively (Tables 19 and 94). Mobile whites, however, obtained a mean of almost twice as many farm jobs, 5.2 (S=3.1), as did semi-mobile whites, 2.8 (S=2.0) (Table 95). The difference between the two distributions is significant. The average length of farm job for each of these categories of migrants was similar, falling within the range of 20-23 days.

The number and average duration of non-farm jobs were much different. The mean number of non-farm jobs ranged from only 1.0 for

Table 19.--MEAN NUMBER OF FARM JOBS OF EMPLOYEE IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Jobs	Number	Mean Number of Jobs
Total	125	4.0	59	4.3
Ia	18	3.1	3	2.3
Ib	17	2.4	5	2.6
IIa	13	4.9	0	---
IIb	23	5.3	5	3.7
III	28	3.9	16	4.3
IV	26	4.0	30	4.8

non-whites to 1.5 for whites, with negligible difference between semi-mobile and mobile whites. There was far greater range in the average (mean) duration of non-farm jobs. The average length of non-farm jobs for semi-mobile whites was 45 days, about twice that of mobile whites (23), of non-whites (24), and, as mentioned above, of farm jobs for any of these categories. The mean of 45 for semi-mobile whites would, however, undoubtedly have been far lower had this category not contained several persons who had had nearly continuous non-farm employment during the year preceding the interviews, hence not being primarily farm laborers.

About two-thirds of the respondents, white and non-white alike, worked on not over five farm jobs during the year (Table 20). Only two per cent of the whites and seven per cent of the non-whites had over 10 jobs during the year.

Adding the non-farm to the farm jobs does not greatly change the picture. About 57 or 58 per cent of the whites and of the non-whites

Table 20.--NUMBER OF FARM JOBS OF EMPLOYEE IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of Jobs	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1-5	93	45	29	22	20	24
6-10	29	10	6	13	5	4
11-15	2	2	0	0	1	0
16-20	1	1	0	1	0	1
21-25	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 & over	0	1	0	0	0	1
Incomplete information	10	8	0	3	4	4

worked on not over five total jobs during the year, and only 2 per cent of the whites and 6 per cent of the non-whites worked on over ten jobs (Table 21). Whites had about the same total number of jobs, a mean of 5.5 (S=4.7) as did non-whites, whose mean was 5.3 (S=4.3) (Tables 22 and 94). The corresponding mean for mobile whites was 6.8 (S=5.6), half again as high as the mean for semi-mobile whites, 4.3 (S=1.9) (Table 95). The difference between the distributions for the mobile and for the semi-mobile whites is highly significant.

Table 21.--NUMBER OF FARM AND NON-FARM JOBS OF EMPLOYEE IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of Jobs	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1-5	78	38	27	16	17	22
6-10	36	11	6	16	6	4
11-15	3	3	0	1	1	0
16-20	1	1	0	1	0	1
21-25	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 & over	2	1	0	1	1	1
Incomplete information	15	13	2	4	5	6

Table 22.--MEAN NUMBER OF FARM AND NON-FARM JOBS OF EMPLOYEE IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of Jobs	Number	Mean Number of Jobs
Total	120	5.5	54	5.3
Ia	17	5.3	3	3.7
Ib	16	3.3	4	3.3
IIa	12	6.3	0	---
IIb	23	7.1	4	9.0
III	27	4.8	15	5.0
IV	25	5.8	28	5.3

In general, then, these laborers obtained only a few jobs during the year and these lasted a mean of about three to four weeks. The median, which was not calculated, would have been even shorter. Exclusion of those laborers who had at least one job, usually non-farm, of several months' duration would almost surely have reduced the mean length of job to under three weeks.

How jobs were obtained

All categories of the migrants reported little use of the Employment Service. Only 6 per cent of the 202 employees stated that they had received any assistance from the Employment Service in obtaining their current jobs. Ninety-one per cent said they had not, and three per cent did not give satisfactory answers. Whether they had families or not and whether white or not, the picture was about the same (Table 23).

Averaging all jobs for the year, even fewer--only four per cent--were reported to have been secured with the help of the Employment Service.

By no means a complete picture of the role of the Employment Service, however, is given by these responses. Twenty-six per cent of the current jobs and 20 per cent of all jobs for the year were reported as having been obtained through a crew leader. The Farm Placement services of the Federal Employment Service, in accordance with laws governing interstate transportation of farm laborers, probably helped in making arrangements for the employment of each or nearly all of the crews represented. In these cases normally only

Table 23.--HOW EMPLOYEES' CURRENT AND TOTAL FARM JOBS FOR THE YEAR WERE OBTAINED, BY RACE AND FAMILY STATUS

How Jobs Were Obtained	White and Non-white Total	White Employees			Non-white Employees		
		Total	Families	Single Employees	Total	Families	Single Employees
Number of:							
Current jobs	202	135	105	30	67	33	34
All farming jobs	806	518	403	115	288	134	154
Per cent of Current Jobs Obtained:							
Through Employment Service	6	6	6	7	6	6	6
Not through Employment Service	91	90	90	90	93	94	91
Method not known	3	4	4	3	1	0	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per cent of total farm jobs obtained:							
Through Employment Service	4	4	3	7	5	8	3
Not through Employment Service	94	94	95	88	93	91	95
Method not known	2	3	2	5	2	1	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per cent of Current Jobs Obtained:							
Through crew leader	26	10	6	23	60	58	62
By arranging with farmer in advance	50	63	71	33	24	30	18
Other ways	21	25	19	40	15	12	18
Method not known	3	4	4	3	1	0	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per cent of total farm jobs obtained:							
Through crew leader	20	8	5	19	41	40	42
By arranging with farmer in advance	51	66	75	36	23	31	15
Other ways	25	23	18	41	28	27	29
Method not known	5	2	2	4	9	1	15
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

the crew leader has direct contact with the Employment Service. In a case where a worker obtained a job from a farmer in a previous year with assistance from the Employment Service and now contacts the farmer directly, the Employment Service obviously played an indirect role in helping the worker obtain his current job, but it would not be reported by the worker. There may have been a number of instances of this. Also some may have received information leading to employment from persons who had secured the information from the Employment Service. It is also possible that winos--inebriates who generally fail to return to work after receiving any wages--and other unreliable persons who only work a day or two at any job and are almost certainly underrepresented in the sample obtained, made much more use of the Employment Service than the migrants interviewed. Probably conservative estimates, therefore, are that around a third of the current jobs and a fourth of all farm jobs obtained by these workers during the year were obtained through some assistance, direct or indirect, of the Employment Service.

Another classification of how the jobs were obtained was used. As mentioned, 26 per cent of all current jobs were obtained through crew leaders. Great differences existed in this respect between whites and non-whites. Only 10 per cent of the whites were members of crews, whereas 60 per cent of the non-whites were (Table 23). Crew affiliation was far more common for white single workers than for white employees having families, the respective percentages being 23 and 6. There was little difference between single and family non-white employees in crew affiliation.

The percentage of all farm jobs for the year obtained through crew leaders was smaller than for current jobs for each category of employee. Eight per cent of all farm jobs of whites and 41 per cent of all farm jobs of non-whites were reproted as obtained through crew leaders. Jobs obtained in home communities would naturally be less likely to involve a crew leader than those obtained elsewhere.

Each employee was also asked how many jobs he obtained by arranging in advance directly with the employer. A half of the current and of all farm jobs were reported in this manner. This is higher than the writers expected and may be inflated by some cases of misunderstanding of faulty communication. Interviewers were carefully instructed to stress the word "directly" and explain that "in advance" meant that the picker had agreed to work for that farmer before the work was ready to be done. This would exclude cases where the worker asked the farmer for employment and began working immediately or within a day or two. There is no doubt, however, that a large number of employees did arrange well in advance for their jobs. This is highly desirable in a number of ways. It generally indicates that the farmer and the laborer are satisfied with each other, reduces the worries of the farmer, maximizes the income of the worker and minimizes his expenses. It also lessens possible detrimental effects on children.

As might be expected, over twice as high a proportion of farm jobs were obtained by prior arrangement with employers by employees with families as by single workers. This was the case for non-whites as well as whites.

Likewise, over twice as high a proportion of farm jobs were secured by prior arrangement by white as by non-white employees. This was true for the employees with families (Classes I-III) and for the single (Class IV) employees. There were no important differences between the current jobs and all farm jobs for the year in the percentages of jobs arranged for in advance.

Several migrant employees did not give satisfactory information on how their jobs were obtained. Most of these indicated that they had had an unknown number of short jobs about which they could not remember details. These situations were classified as "method not known" and each was tabulated as being one job because there was no reasonable basis for estimating the true number. This resulted in some distortion of the data presented in this section, but is not considered important because there were not many such cases and most of the jobs involved were probably very short.

In this section no data have been presented for semi-mobile and mobile whites separately because no difference of consequence between them in how jobs were obtained was found.

Cash Income

The data on cash income are, in general, poor. Although many of the respondents may have given reasonably accurate income information, many others were either unable or unwilling even to give estimates on all of the income questions which were asked.

Consequently, the data presented exclude data for cases for which insufficient information was secured which pertain to the table involved. These cases vary from table to table. Also, it is of course possible that some of the respondents who answered all of the income questions gave estimates which were either high or low. They could have given high estimates to appear to the interviewer that they were better workers or more successful than was actually the case. Some could have given low estimates because they were recipients of some form of public assistance and did not want their true income to be known. Consequently, whether any particular income figure presented is higher or lower than would be the case had accurate and complete data been secured is not known. For these reasons, no tests for significance of differences were calculated for income data.

Income of family at farm labor[9]

The mean income for the year from agricultural work for white families was $1,096, which was over half again as high as for non-white families, $694 (Table 24). The larger size of white families, resulting in more workers per family, can account for much of this difference.

During the year mobile white families earned nearly three times as much at farm work, $1,700, as did semi-mobile families, $605. The difference between the two distributions is highly significant. Most, but not all, of this difference can be accounted for by the fact that mobile white employees obtained over twice as many days of farm work as semi-mobile white employees did.

---

[9] In this section the term families excludes single persons but includes all other families except in the mobile and semi-mobile white categories, where families having no children of school age are excluded as usual.

Table 24.--MEAN INCOME OF FAMILY AT FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

(Information was not obtained for 29 whites and 15 non-whites)

Class	White Families		Non-white Families	
	Number	Mean Income	Number	Mean Income
Total	76	$1096	18	$ 694
I*a*	12	666	1	125
I*b*	13	548	4	312
II*a*	9	1680	0	---
II*b*	19	1709	4	1187
III	23	896	9	708

Five mobile white families earned surprisingly high incomes of between $3,000 and $5,000 at farm work during the year (Table 25). No semi-mobile white and no non-white families earned that much. Five other mobile white families or 18 per cent of this category, earned

Table 25.--INCOME OF FAMILY AT FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Income of Family	Total Families		White Families	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	135	67	35	39
$ 1-499	36	24	15	5
500-999	30	12	6	8
1000-1999	13	4	1	7
2000-2999	10	2	3	3
3000-3999	4	0	0	3
4000-4999	2	0	0	2
Incomplete information	40	25	10	11

less than $500 at farm work. Far more semi-mobile white families and non-white families earned less than $500, the percentages being 60 per cent and 57 per cent respectively.

Income of family head at farm labor

A majority of the family income from farm labor was earned by the heads of the families and this was particularly true for non-whites. From farm work, heads of white families earned a mean of $610, which was about 56 per cent of the mean total for these families, and heads of non-white families earned a mean of $588, which was roughly 80 per cent of the mean total for their families (Table 26).

Table 26.--MEAN INCOME OF FAMILY HEAD AT FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

(Information was not obtained for 62 white and 29 non-white employees)

Class	White Family Heads		Non-white Family Heads	
	Number	Mean Income	Number	Mean Income
Total	54*	$ 610*	15*	$588*
Ia	9	208	1	125
Ib	9	261	4	312
IIa	4	1125	0	---
IIb	14	1071	3	625
III	18	513	7	732
IV	19	717	23	461

*Does not include Class IV employees.

All but one out of 18 white semi-mobile family heads earned less than $500 at farm work whereas only 4 out of 23 white mobile family heads earned so little at farm work (Table 27).

Table 27.--INCOME OF FAMILY HEAD AT FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Income of Head	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
$ 0-499	38	23	17	4	9	15
500-999	23	10	1	8	6	5
1000-1999	8	4	0	4	2	3
2000-2999	7	2	0	4	2	0
3000-3999	1	0	0	1	0	0
4000-4999	2	0	0	2	0	0
Incomplete information	56	28	17	16	11	11

Income of family head at non-farm labor

Heads of white families earned about the same mean amount at non-farm labor, $636, as at farm labor (Table 28). Heads of non-white families earned far less, a mean of only $364. The difference between mobile and semi-mobile whites was much greater. Heads of 35 mobile white families earned a mean of $464 at non-farm work whereas

Table 28.--MEAN INCOME OF FAMILY HEAD AT NON-FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, BY CLASS AND RACE

(Information was not obtained for 26 white and 19 non-white employees)

Class	White Family Heads		Non-white Family Heads	
	Number	Mean Income	Number	Mean Income
Total	109*	$ 636*	48*	$364*
Ia	15	1358	1	125
Ib	12	979	4	937
IIa	12	604	0	---
IIb	23	396	3	125
III	23	592	13	395
IV	24	302	27	300

*Does not include Class IV employees.

heads of 27 semi-mobile white families earned a mean of $1,183 at non-farm work. Two cases in the latter category earned over $4,000 during the year and basically were not, of course, farm laborers (Table 29). No other migrants earned as much as $4,000 at non-farm work.

Table 29.--INCOME OF FAMILY HEAD AT NON-FARM LABOR IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Income of Head	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
$ 0-499	73	39	12	27	22	24
500-999	9	3	2	1	1	2
1000-1999	17	4	7	5	0	0
2000-2999	6	2	4	1	0	1
3000-3999	2	0	0	1	1	0
4000-4999	1	0	1	0	0	0
5000 & over	1	0	1	0	0	0
Incomplete information	26	19	8	4	6	7

Seventy-one per cent of all the respondents earned less than $500 at non-farm work, nothing at all in many cases. Seventy-seven per cent of the mobile white respondents, 73 per cent of the non-whites, and 44 per cent of the semi-mobile whites did not earn as much as $500 at non-farm work.

Total income of family

The reported total income for the respondent families (excluding single worker respondents) was very low for most of the cases. For the 69 white families reporting this information, 35 per cent had less than $1,000 income and only 6 per cent had over $3,000 income (Table 30). For the 14 non-white families reporting total income, 57 per cent received

Table 30.--TOTAL CASH INCOME OF FAMILY IN LAST TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

(To facilitate comparison with other studies the first two columns of data in this table, contrary to the general practice in this report, exclude all data for single workers)

Total Cash Income	Total Families		White Families		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	105	33	35	39	30	34
$ 1-499	9	4	4	3	7	10
500-999	15	4	4	5	7	7
1000-1999	17	4	3	7	1	3
2000-2999	17	2	9	6	1	1
3000-3999	2	0	0	2	2	0
4000-4999	5	0	0	4	0	0
5000 & over	4	0	2	1	0	0
Incomplete information	36	19	13	11	12	13

less than $1,000 and none received over $3,000. The mean for all the reporting white families was $1,893 and the mean for the non-white families was $1,053. The 28 mobile white families for which adequate income data were secured had a mean income for the year of $2,063, which was higher than the mean, $1,784, for the 22 semi-mobile white families who provided adequate income data. The mean for these two groups, which did not include Class III whites, was $1,940.

Even though low, these data are much higher than comparable income data for migrant farm laborer families obtained by studies prior to 1942. Johnson indicated a median family income of $430 from her 1935 survey.[10] The Landis' and Brooks' survey of 1935-1936 reported that the median annual income for single migrants was $334, for family heads, $297, and for entire households, $357.[11] The mean cash income of cotton pickers in Arizona in 1937 was reported by Brown and Cassmore to be $455.[12] Warburton's 1941 survey reported a median of $365 for migratory families.[13]

---

[10] Johnson, Welfare of Families of Sugar-beet Laborers, p. 67.

Recent studies have revealed far higher incomes. The study of the Atlantic Coast migrants in 1952 revealed a crude annual average of roughly between $2,500 and $3,000.[14] In Greene's comprehensive survey of a year later, 56 per cent of the respondents reported estimated total annual family income of less than $2,500, with size of income being positively correlated with mobility--the number of residences in the past 12 months.[15] The average incomes found by these two studies are considerably higher than the average for the present study. They are also high compared to the findings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. This committee found the national average income of men and women who performed more than 25 days of farm work for wages in 1957 to be $892, including $154 earned at non-farm work.[16]

---

[11] Landis and Brooks, Farm Labor in the Yakima Valley, Washington, pp. 54-56.

[12] Brown and Cassmore, Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona, p. 94.

[13] Warburton, The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas, p. 15.

[14] Motheral, Thomas, and Larson, Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream, p. 26.

[15] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, p. 127.

[16] Presented by Fay Bennett in Migratory Labor (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 86 Congress, 1 session, Washington: 1960) Pt. 1, p. 555.

Comparisons between the various studies are very difficult to make because of differences in definitions used and in methods by which the samples were obtained as well as other differences, but it appears obvious that the annual income of migrant farm laborers has increased far more since the late 1930's than the cost of living, which approximately doubled during this period.[17]

Earnings of children in the strawberry harvest

Employment of children in agriculture is a highly controversial issue. One aspect of this employment which is often not mentioned, perhaps because of lack of data, is the amount of such earnings. Do migrant children contribute substantially to the total family income of migrant laborer families, and what relationship is there between age of children and amount earned? Reasonably accurate comprehensive information on these questions is very difficult to secure, partly because of wide day-to-day variations as well as variations among jobs and among children the same age.

Interviewers asked how many quarts of strawberries were picked by each school-age child the day of the interview. Of the 224 white children, 165 were reported as having picked a total of 12,349 quarts, 35 were reported as having not picked (some of these being "back home"), and unsatisfactory information was obtained for the remaining 24 children. Most of the children each age over eight picked and a few children under eight years of age did some picking (Table 31).

---

[17] Table 428, Consumer Price Index, in Statistical Abstract of the United States 1959 (Washington: 1960) p. 333.

Table 31.--QUARTS OF STRAWBERRIES PICKED IN ONE DAY BY SCHOOL-AGE WHITE CHILDREN, BY AGE

Age	Total Children	Number Who Did Not Pick	Information Not Obtained	Number Who Did Pick	Mean for Pickers: Number of Quarts	Mean for Pickers: Wages
Total	224	35	24	165	---	----
6	14	8	0	6	14	$1.12
7	14	9	1	4	21	1.68
8	15	4	4	7	42	3.36
9	14	1	1	12	47	3.76
10	24	2	3	19	49	3.92
11	18	4	1	13	49	3.92
12	22	2	2	18	63	5.04
13	22	0	3	19	78	6.24
14	17	0	1	16	89	7.12
15	17	2	1	14	105	8.40
16	17	1	2	14	99	7.92
17	13	0	2	11	122	9.76
18	15	2	2	11	132	10.56
19	2	0	1	1	70	5.60

Abnormal weather caused the 1958 strawberry harvest in southern Illinois to be subnormal. The number of strawberry harvesting days in this area in a normal year is probably about 18. Multiplying the mean wages per family earned by children in one day by 18 should, consequently, provide a rough estimate of the average financial contribution to the family income of semi-mobile and mobile white families in a typical strawberry harvest season in southern Illinois. Assuming eight cents a quart as the rate of pay for picking, the 165 white children earned a total of $988 a day, which would constitute an average of $13.35 for the 74 white families with school-age children. Eighteen days at this rate would produce a total of $240, which is 12 per cent of the average total family income for the 50 families for which income data are adequate (Table 32).

Table 32.--ESTIMATED MEAN FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION PER FAMILY OF CHILDREN THROUGH PICKING STRAWBERRIES IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, FOR SEMI-MOBILE AND MOBILE WHITE FAMILIES, BY AGE GROUPS

Class and Age of Children	Mean Wages per Family in One Day	Estimated Mean Wages per Family in 18 Days	Estimated Mean Per cent of Annual Family Income
Semi-mobile and Mobile Combined:			
Age:			
Total	$13.35	$240	12
6- 9	1.11	20	1
10-15	7.64	138	7
16-19	4.60	83	4
Semi-mobile:			
Age:			
Total	$11.36	$204	11
6- 9	.68	12	1
10-15	6.87	124	7
16-19	3.81	69	4
Mobile:			
Age:			
Total	$15.14	$273	13
6- 9	1.50	27	1
10-15	8.33	150	7
16-19	5.31	96	5

The age-group distribution for these earnings was $20 (1 per cent) for children under 10, $138 (7 per cent) for children 10 to 15 years of age, and $83 (4 per cent) for children 16 to 19 years of age who attended school during the preceding year. Estimated earnings in the strawberry harvest for the mobile white children were slightly higher than for the semi-mobile white children, partly because fewer of the mobile children remained home instead of participating in the harvest. These estimates include no allowance for under-reporting of picking done by children. It is highly probable that some of the 24 children for whom adequate information was not obtained, did pick strawberries. It is improbable, though, that these cases would have increased the total earnings in southern Illinois of the migrant white children by over ten per cent.

Duration of Migrant Farm Labor Patterns

Migrant farm workers are probably more disadvantaged, economically and in other respects, than any other large occupational category in the United States. It is consequently of considerable importance to discover whether such work is transitional between non-migrant agricultural employment (from which people are being displaced) and non-agricultural employment offering better economic opportunities, *or a dead-end occupation from which few escape once they are in it*. Duration of migrant farm work experience can serve as an indication of the relative strength of these two alternatives. If migrant farm work is primarily transitional, most persons will not remian at such work many years; if it is dead-end, they will.

Similar patterns for the first five months of 1957 and of 1958

Details of the migration-work patterns for approximately the first five months of both 1957 and 1958 were secured. The patterns for early 1958 were similar to those for early 1957 for 56 per cent of the whites and for 30 per cent of the non-whites (Tables 33 and 94). Apparently many more of the whites considered that they had found what, at least for the time being, was the most satisfactory or feasible pattern of employment and migration for them. The low per cent for the non-whites, however, may be a reflection of a tendency of many of them to be relatively unconcerned where they go, to make job decisions almost "on the spur of the moment," and perhaps to prefer variety in the locations they migrate to. These characteristics seem to be more common among unattached men than among men with families, and the proportion of unattached persons was far higher among the non-whites than among the whites.

Table 33.--EMPLOYMENT PATTERN FOR 1957 SIMILAR TO EMPLOYMENT PATTERN FOR 1958, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

(Data cover only the first five months, approximately, of 1957 and of 1958)

Similar Patterns	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
Number:						
Yes	76	20	19	27	9	10
No	59	47	16	12	21	24
Per cent:						
Yes	56	30	54	69	30	29
No	44	70	46	31	70	71

The migration-employment patterns for early 1958 were similar to those for early 1957 for 54 per cent of the semi-mobile white respondents and for 69 per cent of the mobile white respondents (Table 95). The difference between these two percentages, as well as the corresponding difference between whites and non-whites, was highly significant.

Consecutive years migrated to same areas

The whites have a more established migrational pattern from one year to the next than non-whites. The mean number of consecutive years migrated to the same areas was 3.7 (S=4.0) for the whites and 2.3 (S=2.7) for the non-whites (Tables 34 and 94). The difference between the distributions is significant.[18]

Table 34.--MEAN NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS EMPLOYEE MIGRATED TO SAME AREAS, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of years	Number	Mean Number of years
Total	133	3.7	66	2.3
Ia	18	3.8	3	2.0
Ib	17	2.1	8	2.9
IIa	13	3.9	0	---
IIb	26	5.1	5	2.8
III	31	4.2	17	2.4
IV	28	2.9	33	2.0

Mobile whites were found, on the average, to have migrated to the same areas more years than semi-mobile whites, the respective means being 4.7 (S=4.7) and 3.0 (S=2.7) (Table 95). The difference between the two distributions is significant.

Although several migrants, chiefly whites, had been following essentially the same circuit for ten years or more, only 15 per cent had gone to the same areas for over five consecutive years.[19] For whites the percentage was 19, about twice that for non-whites, 9. As expected, more mobile than semi-mobile whites, 26 and 14 per cent respectively, had gone to the same areas for over five consecutive years (Table 35).

---

[18] Since the distribution of values for this and the next two variables are j-shaped, only nonparametric tests of significance were used.

[19] "Same areas" means that each migrant went to the same areas that he did previously, not that these are the same areas as other migrants went to.

Table 35.--NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS EMPLOYEE MIGRATED TO SAME AREAS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Consecutive Years	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1	54	44	16	10	18	22
2- 3	38	10	11	12	5	6
4- 5	16	6	3	7	1	3
6- 9	14	4	3	6	2	1
10-13	5	1	2	1	1	1
14-17	2	1	0	1	1	0
18 & over	4	0	0	2	0	0
Incomplete information	2	1	0	0	2	1

Consecutive years in migrant farm labor

On the average the number of consecutive years the migrants had engaged in migrant farm labor was twice as high as the number of consecutive years they migrated to the same areas. For the non-whites it was almost three times as high. Both the whites and non-whites had migrated to perform agricultural work a mean of about six and one-half consecutive years (Tables 36 and 94). There was a large and highly significant difference between semi-mobile and mobile whites, their means being 4.6 (S=4.4) and 8.1 (S=6.3) years respectively (Table 95).

Thirty-eight per cent of all the migrants had engaged in migrant farm labor for over five consecutive years; six per cent for over 17 years (Table 37). Two-fifths of the whites and one-third of the non-whites had been migrant farm workers for over five years. One-third of the semi-mobile white employees and one-half of the mobile white employees had been migrant workers for over five years. This is another indication that the mobile category contains more of the "professional" white migrant farm workers than the semi-mobile category does.

Table 36.--MEAN NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS EMPLOYEE IN MIGRANT FARM LABOR, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Employees		Non-white Employees	
	Number	Mean Number of years	Number	Mean Number of years
Total	133	6.6	67	6.5
Ia	18	4.3	3	2.3
Ib	17	4.9	8	3.3
IIa	13	6.2	0	---
IIb	26	9.0	5	3.4
III	31	7.1	17	4.2
IV	28	6.6	34	9.3

Table 37.--NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS EMPLOYEE IN MIGRANT FARM LABOR, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Consecutive Years	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1	29	19	12	2	9	6
2- 3	30	13	7	10	8	6
4- 5	20	13	4	6	4	7
6- 9	30	13	10	11	2	7
10-13	10	2	1	4	2	2
14-17	8	1	1	4	0	0
18 & over	6	6	0	2	3	6
Incomplete information	2	0	0	0	2	0

Total years in migrant farm labor

On the average, the respondents had migrated to engage in farm work a mean of 8.6 total years, about two years longer than the mean number of consecutive years. The mean number of total years was 9.8 (S=12.2) for the non-whites and 8.0 (S=8.3) for the whites (Table 94). The difference between the distributions was significant, but the direction of the relationship was inconsistent. There was also a significant difference between the semi-mobile and mobile whites, their respective means being 5.5 (S=4.8) and 9.3 (S=7.1) (Table 95).

Nearly twice as high a proportion of non-whites--23 per cent--as of whites--12 per cent--reported that this was the first year they migrated to perform seasonal farm labor (Table 38).[20] The writers do

Table 38.--TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYEE IN MIGRANT FARM LABOR, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES

Number of years	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
1	16	15	6	1	6	5
2- 3	34	9	10	8	10	5
4- 5	20	10	5	7	5	4
6-10	31	16	10	11	1	10
11-20	23	5	4	9	2	2
21-30	7	5	0	3	2	5
31-40	0	2	0	0	0	1
41-50	2	1	0	0	2	0
51 & over	0	2	0	0	0	2
Incomplete information	2	2	0	0	2	0

---

[20] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, page 50, reported that 9.3 per cent of the migrant workers in his sample were first-year migrants.

not know how to account for this difference. On the other hand, twice as high a proportion of non-whites--15 per cent--as of whites--7 per cent--stated that they had engaged in migrant farm work for over 20 years or "all their lives." Keeping in mind that a considerable number of the migrant employees were not very old, it is obvious from Table 38 that migrant farm work becomes an occupational career for numerous laborers. This is more likely to be true for mobile than for semi-mobile whites.

CHAPTER VI

LIVING CONDITIONS, HEALTH, AND MEDICAL CARE

Living Conditions

Nearly all of the migrant farm laborers in southern Illinois use housing accommodations provided by their employers. On the average these accommodations are poor. This is not surprising for at least four reasons:

(1) Most of the jobs last only two or three weeks and a considerable percentage of the farmers employ most of their migrants for only that length of time. To provide moderately expensive housing and facilities for the migrants for so short a period would result in extremely high costs per day of use.

(2) Fruit growing is a highly competitive type of agriculture operating on close margins and without the benefits of farm subsidy programs common for major crops such as wheat and cotton.

(3) The migrant farm laborers do not demand good housing. Most of them did not indicate much concern about it to the growers, nor did they even to the interviewers. Many of them probably have poor housing and meager facilities in their home communities.

(4) Some migrants discourage farmers from providing good housing and facilities through mistreatment of these and through theft of things like bedding and kitchen utensils when these are provided.

Housing

About one-fifth of the employees lived in single-family houses, which varied considerably in quality (Table 39). A little over one-half lived in shacks or simple structures divided into rooms with outside entrances, each room a separate dwelling unit. Most of these were built specially for migrant workers. Occasionally a side of a barn was partitioned into rooms. When the remainder of the barn was used for storing machinery and equipment in bad weather, these rooms were grouped into the category which included shacks because they were of equivalent quality. Two per cent lived in tents and six per cent in trailers, usually their own.

Table 39.--NATURE OF PRESENT HOUSING, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Present Housing	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Single-family house	43	31	12	10	11	7	6
Shack, shed, barn, etc.	108	78	30	22	19	16	14
Tent	4	1	3	1	0	0	2
House trailer	13	13	0	0	5	2	0
Other	34	12	22	2	4	5	12

The remaining 17 per cent had living accommodations of a variety of sorts--an abandoned one-room rural school, sheds or other inferior structures, and in at least one or two cases pick-up trucks owned by the migrants. One Negro family used a wooden structure in which geese were generally kept.[1]

About two-thirds of the migrant employees had housing with wooden floors and a quarter had housing with concrete floors. Eight per cent had only dirt floors and three per cent had other types, including gravel (Table 40).

Table 40.--NATURE OF FLOOR, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Nature of Floor	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Wood	130	83	47	20	26	17	23
Concrete	50	41	9	13	11	8	4
Dirt	16	7	9	2	1	4	6
Other	6	4	2	0	1	1	1

Although single workers constituted less than a third of the total number of migrant employees, they had about half of the very poorest quality housing. Except in so far as a higher proportion of non-whites than of whites were single, there did not seem to be any appreciable difference between whites and non-whites in quality of housing, including type of floor. Mobile white families had a slight advantage over semi-mobile white families in quality of housing.

---

[1] Without knowing how this came about, a highly inaccurate impression could be formed about the farmer's attitude toward, and treatment of, his workers. The Negro migrant applied for work after the farmer had already obtained all the strawberry pickers he needed and wanted. The farmer replied that he had all the pickers he could use, that there might not be sufficient work to go around if he added to his crew, and that he had no place to put any more workers. The laborer insisted that he was in desperate need of work, could not find any, and begged for work even if no housing was available. The farmer, who performs many favors for his workers which most employers would never consider performing, reluctantly consented to let the Negro family pick.

Far greater differences occurred in number of rooms and in sharing of rooms. About two-thirds of the migrant families had one room per family and fourteen per cent more had two or more rooms, whereas only 30 per cent of the single workers had private rooms (Table 41). Seven per cent of the families shared rooms with one non-relative and 27 per cent with two or more non-relatives. In contrast, 9 per cent of the single workers shared rooms with one non-relative and 58 per cent shared rooms with two or more non-relatives. White families with school-age children, being larger in general than the other families, more often had two or more rooms to themselves and less often shared rooms with non-relatives. Except that four semi-mobile white families as compared with only one mobile white family shared rooms with non-relatives, there was little difference between these two categories

Table 41.--NUMBER OF ROOMS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Number of Rooms	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
1 room	108	89	19	23	28	13	5
2 or more rooms	21	20	1	8	9	1	0
1 room shared with:							
1 non-relative	15	8	7	1	0	5	1
2 or more non-relatives	55	15	40	3	1	9	28
Other	3	3	0	0	1	2	0

in the number of rooms they had.

Sharing of rooms was far more common among the non-whites than the whites. Eighty-five per cent of the single non-whites as compared to 47 per cent of the single whites shared rooms with non-relatives. The difference between white and non-white families was even greater, no doubt partly because of a higher percentage of the non-white families were small, often consisting only of the employee and his wife.

Housing conditions for migrant farm workers is about the same in many other states as in Illinois. Migrant Agricultural Labor in Ohio contains a typical description of these conditions.[2]

Facilities

All but six of the 202 employees, including all of the single workers, reported that the only toilet facilities consisted of outside toilets or privies. Some of these toilets were shared by considerable numbers of people. Four of the employees said that they had flush toilets in their living quarters and two reported that no toilet facilities were provided. The writers do not know the circumstances which resulted in the last two responses--whether toilets were so far away that the respondents did not consider them available, whether toilets actually were not available, whether the interviewers made errors in marking these schedules, or what. One of these respondents was the only one interviewed on the farm where he worked. The other migrant worked on a farm for which four employees interviewed stated that an outside toilet was available and the only other employee interviewed on that farm stated that his family had a flush toilet in his living quarters. It is obvious that toilet facilities constitute one of the poorest aspects of the living conditions of the migrant laborers in southern Illinois.

---

[2] Wade H. Andrews and Saad Z. Nagi, Migrant Agricultural Labor in Ohio (Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin No. 780, Wooster, Ohio: 1956) pp. 16-17.

Over half of the migrant employees reported that no laundry facilities were available. Seven per cent had access to non-automatic washing machines, none to automatic washing machines, and laundry tubs were available to 37 per cent of the migrant employees (Table 42).

Table 42.--LAUNDRY FACILITIES, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Laundry Facilities	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Non-automatic	15	15	0	4	3	3	0
Tubs, etc.	74	35	39	8	8	10	21
Stream or pond	2	1	1	1	0	0	1
None	108	82	26	20	28	17	12
No information	3	2	1	2	0	0	0

Notwithstanding the fact that 12 white families and 3 white single persons as compared with no non-whites had access to non-automatic washing machines, the laundry situation was as poor in general for whites as for non-whites. Likewise, the net differences in respect to laundry facilities were not large between families and single persons or between semi-mobile and mobile white families.

Bathing facilities were no better. Only 7 per cent of the employees (three single persons and 11 families, including one non-white family) had any access to a modern tub or shower, 38 per cent had access to a wash tub, 9 per cent had acces to a pond or stream, and nearly half (46 per cent) had no bathing facilities at all (Table 43).

Table 43.--BATHING FACILITIES, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Bathing Facilities	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Modern tub or shower in living quarters	3	3	0	0	2	1	0
Modern tub or shower elsewhere	11	10	1	2	6	2	0
Wash tub	76	37	39	12	11	4	21
Pond or stream	19	14	5	2	2	7	3
None	92	71	21	19	18	16	10
No information	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

As was the case for laundry facilities, in general the bathing facilities were as poor for families as for single persons and as poor for whites as for non-whites. Mobile white families on the whole fared a little better than semi-moible white families, six more of them having access to a modern tub or shower.

There was much variation in the number and types of other facilities and items of equipment furnished by farmers to the migrant agricultural laborers. Eighty-three per cent of the migrants were furnished electricity and lighting by their employers (Table 44). Beds or cots, the next most frequently furnished item, were supplied to over two-thirds of the employees. Bedding, however, was provided to only 14 per cent of the employees, partly because it is easy for migrants to carry away bedding. Stoves were furnished to just half of the migrant employees and cooking utensils and dishes to only one-tenth.

Table 44.--OTHER FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FURNISHED BY FARMER, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Type	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Electricity and lighting	166	107	59	29	30	22	30
Beds and cots	138	77	61	23	20	18	33
Bedding	28	14	14	2	4	6	8
Stove	101	51	50	12	15	15	26
Cooking utensils and dishes	19	6	13	1	1	4	7
Running water:							
In living quarters	6	5	1	1	3	1	1
Elsewhere	44	38	6	9	14	8	4
Refrigeration	18	13	5	1	5	4	2

Nothing else was furnished to as many as a quarter of the workers. Only three per cent had running water in their living quarters, but 22 per cent had access to running water outside of their living quarters. In other words, nearly all the migrants had to carry water into their living quarters and by far the most common source of water was from open wells. It might be added that this was the only source of water for some of the farmers themselves. Refrigeration was furnished to only nine per cent of the migrant employees.

Non-whites, on the average, were furnished more of these itmes than were the whites. One reason may be that the whites were more inclined to bring some of these items along with them. Running water and refrigeration were the only facilities provided less frequently to non-whites than whites. There was little net difference in the facilities and equipment furnished to semi-mobile and to mobile whites. Single employees were furnished more of these items, on the average, than were families, and among the single employees the non-whites were furnished more than the whites.

Health

The only direct index of health was obtained through asking the respondents how mant days each of their children had been sick during the previous twelve months. How much inaccuracy was contained in the replies is not known, but may well have been considerable, as is probably typical of morbidity data gathered in this manner.

Of the 275 children of school age, no days of illness were reported for 63 per cent, 1-10 days for 27 per cent, 11-30 days for 8 per cent, and 31 days or over for 2 per cent (Table 45). White children were reported to have had more illness on the average than non-white children. Part or all of this difference might, however, have been caused by more under-reporting of illness by non-whites than by whites. About the same amount of illness was reported for semi-mobile as for mobile white children.

Table 45.--NUMBER OF DAYS CHILD WAS SICK DURING THE PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Days	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	174	137	37	64	73
1-10	74	62	12	37	25
11-30	21	20	1	11	9
31-60	3	3	0	1	2
61 & over	3	2	1	1	1

Medical Care[3]

Vaccinations and skin test for tuberculosis

Most of the migrant children were reported to have been vaccinated for smallpox, 39 per cent within the preceding four years and another 39 per cent earlier (Table 46). Eighty-one per cent of the vaccinations were reported to have occurred at school (Table 47).[4]

There was no important difference between the proportions of whites and non-whites reported to have been vaccinated for smallpox. A smaller proportion of the whites, however, was reported to have received these vaccinations during the last four years. Apparently more of the non-whites came from schools with vaccination programs, because 95 per cent of the vaccinated non-whites as compared with 78 per cent of the vaccinated whites were reported to have been vaccinated at school.

---

[3] The percentages given in this section are based upon the cases for which adequate information on the item under consideration was obtained. Without exception these cases constitute a very high majority of the 275 migrant children. The percentages do not appear in the tables presented, but are based on the data in the appropriate tables.

[4] The phrase "at school" is used in this chapter to mean either occurring on school property or occurring elsewhere as part of the school health program available free to all pupils in the classes involved.

Table 46.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS VACCINATED FOR SMALLPOX, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	20	15	5	10	5
1	41	32	9	13	19
2-3	41	31	10	21	10
4 & over	100	91	9	41	50
Never	57	47	10	22	25
Incomplete information	16	8	8	7	1

Table 47.--SMALLPOX VACCINATION AT SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Vaccination at School	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
Yes	176	139	37	77	62
No	42	40	2	17	23
Not applicable	46	39	7	18	21
Incomplete information	11	6	5	2	4

The only differences worth reporting between the semi-mobile and the mobile white children in smallpox vaccinations were that the vaccinations of the mobile white children occurred less recently on the average and fewer of them occurred at school.

Diphtheria, whooping cough, or tetanus vaccinations were reported for about three-fifths of the migrant children--35 per cent within the preceding four years and 26 per cent earlier (Table 48). Nearly three-fourths of the vaccinations were reported to have occurred at school (Table 49).

Table 48.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS VACCINATED FOR DIPHTHERIA, WHOOPING COUGH, OR TETANUS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	11	9	2	5	4
1	50	37	13	12	25
2-3	26	21	5	14	7
4 & over	66	65	1	26	39
Never	98	78	20	47	31
Incomplete information	24	14	10	10	4

Table 49.--DIPHTHERIA, WHOOPING COUGH, OR TETANUS VACCINATION AT SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Vaccination at School	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
Yes	134	109	25	48	61
No	49	46	3	24	22
Not applicable	85	67	18	41	26
Incomplete information	7	2	5	1	1

A much higher proportion of the whites than of the non-whites were reported to have ever been vaccinated for diphtheria, whooping cough, or tetanus, but a smaller proportion of their vaccinations were obtained during the preceding four years. Whereas 70 per cent of vaccinations of white children occurred at school, 89 per cent of the vaccinations of non-whites occurred there.

More mobile than semi-mobile white children had been vaccinated for at least one of these three diseases, more of their vaccinations were over four years old, and more of their vaccinations occurred at school.

Slightly over half of the migrant children were reported to have been vaccinated for polio within the preceding four years, a large majority of these vaccinations having occurred at school (Tables 50 and 51).

Fewer non-white than white children had been vaccinated for polio. Of those vaccinated, 84 per cent of the whites and all of the non-whites had been vaccinated at school. Nine per cent of both the semi-mobile and mobile white children had been vaccinated independently of school health programs, but a few more semi-mobile than mobile white children had been vaccinated at school.

About a third of the migrant children were reported to have received a skin test for tuberculosis, most of these tests having occurred within the previous four years (Table 52). Nearly four-fifths of the children who received skin tests for tuberculosis did so at school (Table 53).

A smaller proportion of non-whites than whites were reported to have received these skin tests. Whereas 61 of the 79 white children receiving skin tests did so in school, 8 of the 9 non-whites received

Table 50.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS VACCINATED FOR POLIO, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	42	32	10	22	10
1	76	72	4	30	42
2-3	21	16	5	11	5
4 & over	5	5	0	5	0
Never	116	90	26	41	49
Incomplete information	15	9	6	5	4

Table 51.--POLIO VACCINATION AT SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Vaccination at School	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
Yes	134	109	25	60	49
No	21	21	0	11	10
Not applicable	113	90	23	41	49
Incomplete information	7	4	3	2	2

Table 52.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS GIVEN A SKIN TEST FOR TUBERCULOSIS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	16	15	1	7	8
1	27	27	0	15	12
2-3	22	22	0	13	9
4 & over	13	12	1	9	3
Never	166	129	37	62	67
Incomplete information	31	19	12	8	11

theirs in school.[5] Mobile white children were a little less likely than semi-mobile children to have ever received a skin test for tuber culosis and a little more likely to have received the test in school.

Table 53.--SKIN TEST FOR TUBERCULOSIS GIVEN AT SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Skin test at School	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
Yes	69	61	8	32	29
No	19	18	1	12	6
Not applicable	150	117	33	54	63
Incomplete information	37	28	9	16	12

About one out of ten of the migrant children was reported to have never been vaccinated for any of the diseases mentioned--smallpox, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, or polio--or to have received the skin test for tuberculosis and an additional 17 per cent to have received none of these during the preceding four years (Table 54). Over twice as high a proportion of non-whites as whites were reported to have received none of these types of medical services. No substantial difference in this respect between mobile and semi-mobile white children was found.

---

5. Seven of the nine non-white children who were reported by their parents to have received skin tests for tuberculosis were classified in the "incomplete information" category in Table 53 because the parents could not remember how long ago the tests were given. Many people are not familiar with skin tests for tuberculosis, and it is likely that a number of the responses were only guesses.

Table 54.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS VACCINATED FOR SMALLPOX, DIPHTHERIA, WHOOPING COUGH, TETANUS, OR POLIO OR RECEIVED SKIN TEST FOR TUBERCULOSIS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	60	46	14	28	18
1	93	81	12	39	42
2-3	34	32	2	16	16
4 & over	42	35	7	15	20
Never	24	16	8	8	8
Incomplete information	22	14	8	8	6

Examinations

Forty-five per cent of the children were reported to have never had their teeth examined by a dentist (Table 55). About the same per cent had had their teeth examined by a dentist during the preceding four years. Proportionally, far more non-white than white children and considerably more semi-mobile than mobile white children were reported to have never had their teeth examined by a dentist.

Sixty-three per cent of the 132 children reported to have ever had a dental examination by a dentist were reported to have had the examination at school (Table 56). Presumably the remaining 37 per cent (49 children) were examined in dentists' offices. Just under half of the reported dental examinations of non-white and also of semi-mobile white children were reported to have occurred at school. The corresponding proportion for mobile white children was slightly over three-fourths. Apparently fewer mobile than semi-mobile children would have had dental examinations had it not been for school dental programs.

Table 55.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD'S TEETH WERE EXAMINED BY A DENTIST, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number of Years	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	23	21	2	14	7
1	70	65	5	28	37
2-3	25	22	3	6	16
4 & over	14	11	3	3	8
Never	115	84	31	51	33
Incomplete information	28	21	7	12	9

Table 56.--DENTAL EXAMINATION GIVEN AT SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Examination at School	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
Yes	83	77	6	25	52
No	49	42	7	26	16
Not applicable	115	84	31	51	33
Incomplete information	28	21	7	12	9

All of the medical services mentioned above are provided free to all students in at least some grades in many schools or as part of the school program of many schools. Medical examinations by physicians, however, are not. Ordinarily only in case of an emergency, and oftentimes not even then, do schools arrange for such examinations free to their pupils. Nevertheless, over half, 55 per cent, of the children were reported to have been examined by a physician within the previous four years (Table 57). An additional 16 per cent were reported to have received medical examinations but not within the previous four years, and 29 per cent were reported never to have been examined by a physician. If the latter figure is approximately accurate, it indicates that a substantial proportion of the children of the migrant laborers who come to southern Illinois receive almost no medical care. Also, most of the medical care the migrant children do receive apparently is received through school health programs.

Table 57.--NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CHILD WAS EXAMINED BY A PHYSICIAN, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Number	Total Children			White Children	
of Years	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	275	224	51	114	110
0	41	35	6	21	14
1	50	41	9	16	25
2-3	38	31	7	25	6
4 & over	38	32	6	13	19
Never	67	53	14	21	32
Incomplete information	41	32	9	18	14

Attitudes Toward Amount of Medical Care

When asked if their families received as much medical care as the migrant laborer respondents considered necessary, slightly over two-thirds replied in the affirmative, only 31 per cent stating that they did not (Table 58). All six of the categories selected for making comparisons--all white families, all non-white families, semi-mobile white families, mobile white families, white single employees, and non-white single employees--gave about the same distribution of responses.

Table 58.--RESPONDENT'S FAMILY RECEIVES AS MUCH MEDICAL CARE AS HE THINKS IS NECESSARY, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Receives Necessary Amount	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Yes	135	93	42	25	29	21	24
No	61	38	23	10	10	6	9
Incomplete information	6	4	2	0	0	3	1

Being low-income families, they were asked if they would obtain more medical care if it were less expensive. Fifty-six per cent said they would (Table 59). The cost of medical care was said to limit the amount of medical care received by higher proportions of non-white than white families, of semi-mobile than mobile white families, and of non-white than white single workers.

About two-fifths of the employees considered medical expenses a "serious problem" for them (Table 60). Single workers were less

Table 59.--RESPONDENT'S FAMILY WOULD OBTAIN MORE MEDICAL CARE IF IT WERE LESS EXPENSIVE, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Would Obtain More Medical Care	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Yes	104	63	41	22	14	10	19
No	81	60	21	11	23	16	12
Incomplete information	17	12	5	2	2	4	3

inclined to look upon medical expenses as one of their serious problems. No differences of consequence between whites and non-whites appeared for this question. One-half of the heads of semi-mobile white families, as contrasted with one-third of the heads of mobile white families, stated that they regarded medical expenses as a serious problem for them.

Table 60.--MEDICAL COSTS ARE CONSIDERED A SERIOUS PROBLEM, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Medical Costs Are a Serious Problem	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Yes	81	55	26	17	13	8	10
No	118	77	41	18	26	20	24
Incomplete information	3	3	0	0	0	2	0

CHAPTER VII

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN

Previous studies have revealed a great amount of educational retardation of children of migrant farm laborers, much of which can logically be attributed to the mobility of migrant laborer families. An important objective of this study has been to obtain objective information concerning the degree to which the mobility of present-day migrant farm laborer families who pick strawberries in southern Illinois interferes with the education of the children involved.

There is much variation in the accuracy of the data presented in this chapter. The information which was verified from school records in the home communities of the children may be considered highly accurate. The remainder of the educational information obtained may be among the most inaccurate presented in this report. Classes Ia and IIa contain the cases for which the employees gave reasonably accurate school information and Classes Ib and IIb includes 48 cases in which they did not (for these cases information from school records was used), 37 cases for which the school reported no record of the child, and 58 cases for which no reply was received from the school, as mentioned in Chapter III. Adequate interpretation of the data is dependent upon keeping in mind the probability of considerable error in data for Classes Ib and IIb.

Enrollment and Attendance

Enrollment

Although over four-fifths of the school-age children of the migrants--both white and non-white--were reported by their parents to have attended school during the preceding year, the correct proportion of those attending school may have been substantially smaller (Table 61). As mentioned in Chapter III, in one-fourth of the cases for which a reply was received from the superintendent or principal of the school the child was reported to have attended, the reply was that the school had no record of the child attending that school, at least during the preceding year. There is no way of finding out what proportion of these did not even enroll in school during the preceding year. It may have been high. On the other hand, 11 of the 48 children reported not in school were only six years old. A majority of these were probably too young to have started school at the beginning of the school year. It appears probable that at least a fourth, and possibly a third or more of the 275 children did not attend school at

Table 61.--NUMBER AND PER CENT OF CHILDREN NOT IN SCHOOL, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Children			Non-white Children		
	Total	Not in School		Total	Not in School	
	Number	Number	Per cent	Number	Number	Per cent
Total	224	40	18	51	8	16
Ia	59	14	24	13	3	23
Ib	55	5	9	18	1	7
IIa	37	7	19	0	-	--
IIb	73	14	19	20	4	20

all during the school year preceding the interviewing.

The data obtained indicate a slightly higher proportion of non-white than of white children who did not enroll in school. It is also likely that a higher proportion of mobile than of semi-mobile white children did not enroll at any school. Only 19 per cent of the white children in Class IIa (mobile white children for whom information was verified by school authorities) as compared with 24 per cent of the white children in Class Ia (semi-mobile white children for whom information was verified by school authorities) were reported by their parents as not having gone to school during the previous year. Notwithstanding this, it appears probable that the proportion of non-enrollment for all of the mobile white children exceeded the corresponding proportion for all of the semi-mobile white children for three reasons:

(1) False reporting of enrollment could only have occurred for classes Ib and IIb, and the number of Class IIb children was almost twice as high as the number of Class IIa children whereas the number of Class Ib children was a little smaller than the number of Class Ia children. For one thing, this indicates a probability that inaccurate and deliberately false responses were more common among mobile than among semi-mobile families.

(2) A higher proportion of Class IIb than of Class Ib white children were reported by their parents as not having enrolled in any school during the year.

(3) The greater the amount of mobility during school terms the more interference there will be with schooling. The shorter the

period of time a family remains or expects to remain in a community, the less likely it is that the children will be sent to school. It may well be that this tendency is partly caused by a greater reluctance of parents who value education highly to migrate in search of work during school terms.

Attendance

Considering only the white children first, the white children--according to the information obtained--who attended school during the preceding year missed an average of 33 days of school during that year (Table 62).[1] The actual mean number of days missed may have been much greater because of probably extensive under-reporting for some of the cases in Classes Ib and IIb. It should be kept in mind that the mean of 33 days absent does not include the absences of those school-age children who were reported to have not attended school at all during the year.

Information on school attendance was obtained for each locality visited by the migrant laborer family. This made it possible to estimate through the following formula the number of days of school missed because of migration: the number of days of the standard 180-day school year a child was away from his home community minus the total number of days he attended school elsewhere.[2] The mean of reported days absent from school estimated to be due to migration was 20, over half of the mean days absent for all reasons. The correct mean may have been considerably higher.

---

[1] The data used are those received from the school administrators for those cases in which the administrators reported that the children attended their schools. For all other cases, the data used are based on information supplied by the migrant laborer parents and undoubtedly varies greatly in accuracy from case to case.

The apparent discrepancies within Table 62 and between that Table and Tables 63 and 64 are caused by cases omitted because of incomplete information. For some children there was enough information to determine the total days of school missed but not how many were missed because of migration and for a few children the reverse was true. For Class Ib and Class IIb it can be assumed that the data presented understate both the number of total days absent from school and the number of days absent caused by migration.

Table 62.--MEAN NUMBER OF TOTAL DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL AND MEAN NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT BECAUSE OF MIGRATION, BY CLASS AND RACE

Class	White Children				Non-white Children			
	Total Days Absent		Days Absent Because of Migration		Total Days Absent		Days Absent Because of Migration	
	Mean	Number of Cases	Mean	Number of cases	Mean	Number of Cases	Mean	Number of Cases
Total	33	178	20	172	40	39	46	28
Ia	17	45	1	41	10	10	0	10
Ib	21	49	2	46	20	14	28	5
IIa	39	29	29	29	--	0	--	0
IIb	53	55	48	56	78	15	85	13

According to the data obtained, the mean number of days absent from school for the white children in Class Ia (those who spent all or almost all of the school year in their home communities and gave school information which was verified) was 17, less than half as great as the mean, 39, for Class II*a*. The difference is highly significant.[3] Almost all of the days absent from school had to be for reasons other than migration for the Class I*a* children, whereas about three-fourths of the days absent from school for the Class II*a* white children is estimated to have been due to migration.

---

[2] This formula overestimates migration as a cause of non-attendance because it makes no allowance for the number of days of school these children would have missed had they remained home during that part of the school year they migrated.

Because of the lack of concentration around most of these means, Tables 63 and 64 are presented to show the wide distribution of days absent from school for selected categories of children. Partly to avoid small numbers, the Class I*b* and Class II*b* cases are included in these tables. Consequently, these data understate the amount of absence from school. A comparison of the mobile-white column of Table 63 (total days absent from school) with the mobile-white column of Table 64 (total days absent because of migration, estimated as described above) confirms that extensive absence from school of mobile white children was generally associated with long absences from the home community.

To compare the school attendance data obtained for non-whites with that for whites is hazardous because the porportion of cases for which no verification could be procured was even higher for the non-whites than for the whites. On the basis of the data obtained, however, the non-white children missed seven more days of school on the average than the white children did and they missed 26 more days of school

---

[3] The mean difference between all semi-mobile white children and all mobile white children was not calculated because of lack of confidence in the accuracy of data for some of the cases in Classes I*b* and II*b*. Other differences in this section were also not tested for statistical significance because of doubt regarding the accuracy of the data.

Table 63.--NUMBER OF TOTAL DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Total Days Missed	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	227	184	43	95	89
0	24	12	12	10	2
1- 20	93	84	9	57	27
21- 40	43	39	4	18	21
41- 60	18	14	4	3	11
61-100	17	11	6	4	7
101-140	14	13	1	0	13
141 & over	9	5	4	2	3
Incomplete information	9	6	3	1	5

Table 64.--NUMBER OF TOTAL DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL BECAUSE OF MIGRATION, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Total Days Missed	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	227	184	43	95	89
0	105	92	13	78	14
1- 10	11	11	0	4	7
11- 20	24	23	1	5	18
21- 40	29	25	4	0	25
41- 60	1	1	0	0	1
61-100	15	10	5	0	10
101-140	9	8	1	0	8
141 & over	6	2	4	0	2
Incomplete information	27	12	15	8	4

because of migration than the white children did (Tables 62, 63, and 64). A large majority of the total days of school missed by the non-white children was due to migration whereas only a little over half of the total days of school missed by the white children can be attributed to migration unless allowance is made for false information having been given by some respondents.

Manis reported that the "typical" migrant child in his study lost 26 days out of the "standard" 175-day school year.[4] Allowing for the fact that 180 days was considered in the present study to be a standard school year, on the average the migrant children in the Manis' study were reported to have lost only two days a year less of school than was reported for the children in this survey.

Retardation

Grade progress by years attended school

Retardation in school may be measured in more than one way. One measure used in this report is to compare the highest grade completed with the number of years in (having attended) school.[5] Seven per cent of the migrant white children were reported to have completed a higher grade than the number of years they had attended school, 37 per cent had completed a grade a year, and 56 per cent were retarded--had completed less than an average of a grade a year (Table 65). The respective percentages for non-whites were 2.5, 30, and 67.5 (Table 66).

---

[4] Manis, A Study of Migrant Education, p. 13.

[5] Parents were asked how many years it had been since their child (for each child) first started school. This was considered to be the wording which would produce the most accurate results. It is rare for a school-age child to remain out of school all of any one school year between the time he first attends school and when he finally quits attending school (excluding college). The parent's statement of how many years it had been since his child started school was, therefore, interpreted to also be the number of years the child had attended school.

Table 65.--GRADE PROGRESS OF MIGRANT WHITE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL

Years in School	Number of Children in School								
	Total	Advanced	Normal	Retarded	Number of Years Retarded				
					1	2	3	4	5 or more
Total	184	13	68	103	70	15	9	5	3
1	12	1	9	2	2	0	0	0	0
2	14	0	5	9	9	0	0	0	0
3	18	1	8	9	8	1	0	0	0
4	18	1	8	9	7	2	0	0	0
5	22	1	9	12	10	1	0	0	0
6	20	4	4	12	6	3	2	1	0
7	19	2	4	13	11	0	1	0	1
8	19	1	6	12	6	2	2	1	1
9	15	1	6	8	2	3	2	1	0
10	14	0	3	11	6	2	1	1	1
11	6	1	4	3	0	0	1	0	0
12	5	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	0
13	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
14	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

Table 66.--GRADE PROGRESS OF MIGRANT NON-WHITE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL

Years in School	Number of Children in School								
	Total	Advanced	Normal	Retarded	Number of Years Retarded				
					1	2	3	4	5 or more
Total	40	1	12	27	14	8	2	0	3
1	3	0	3	00	0	0	0	0	0
2	6	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	0
3	6	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0
4	6	0	1	5	3	2	0	0	0
5	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
6	3	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0
7	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
8	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1
9	4	0	0	4	1	2	1	0	0
10	3	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	0
11	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Notwithstanding the fact that non-white schools on the average have lower standards than white schools, the migrant non-white children were more retarded than the migrant white children.

Age-grade status

Another measure of retardation in school is age-grade status. Assuming that children normally enter school between their sixth and seventh birthdays, those who were seven by the end of the 1957-1958 school year would have finished the first grade had they done satisfactory school work, those who were eight would have completed the second grade, etc. A ten-year old child who had completed the fifth grade by June 1958 would be considered underage whereas a thirteen-year old who had completed no higher than the fifth grade would be considered two years overage. The 19-year-old children were grouped with the 18-year-old children, If they had completed the twelfth grade they were considered to have normal age-grade status, if they had completed only the eleventh grade they were classified as being one-year overage, etc. Six white and one non-white children age six were reported to have completed the first grade and eight white and three non-white children age six were reported as not having gone to school. These 18 cases were excluded from the analysis of the age-grade status index of retardation because they had no opportunity to be overage for their grade.

According to the information obtained concerning the 178 white children 7 to 19 years of age who were reported to have attended school during the nine-months preceding the interviewing, almost one-fifth were underage for their grade and 28 per cent had normal age-grade status (Table 67).[6] Over half were overage or retarded. A majority of the overage white children in school were overage only one year, but 12 per cent were three or more years overage.

Table 67.--AGE-GRADE STATUS OF MIGRANT WHITE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL, AGE 7-18

Age	Number of Children in School								
	Total	Underage	Normal	Overage	Number of Years Overage				
					1	2	3	4	5 or more
Total	178	33	50	95	57	16	16	3	3
7	11	3	7	1	1	0	0	0	0
8	14	4	3	7	7	0	0	0	0
9	14	1	3	10	9	1	0	0	0
10	22	5	8	9	8	0	1	0	0
11	18	2	5	11	9	1	1	0	0
12	21	6	3	12	5	6	1	0	0
13	22	6	2	14	8	2	2	1	1
14	16	3	3	10	4	2	3	0	1
15	14	2	5	7	2	2	3	0	0
16	10	0	1	9	3	1	3	1	1
17	9	1	5	3	0	1	2	0	0
18	7	0	5	2	1	0	0	1	0

Retardation among the in-school non-white children was even more extensive. Ten per cent were reported to be underage and 22 per cent normal age (Table 68). Slightly over two-thirds were overage, a majority of these being one year overage and 15 per cent being three or more years overage.

To facilitate comparisons--particularly between semi-mobile and

---

6. Being classified underage by this index does not necessarily indicate that a child skipped a grade. Instead, his birthday may have occurred in June, July, or August or he may have begun school before his sixth birthday.

Table 68.--AGE-GRADE STATUS OF MIGRANT NON-WHITE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL AGE 7-19

Age	Number of Children in School								
	Total	Underage	Normal	Overage	Number of Years Overage				
					1	2	3	4	5 or more
Total	41	4	9	28	17	5	3	1	2
7	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
8	6	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
9	6	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0
10	8	1	1	6	3	3	0	0	0
11	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
13	5	0	0	5	2	0	2	1	0
14	5	0	1	4	2	1	1	0	0
15	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
16	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
17	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

mobile white children--for different ages, the mean amount of retardation as measured by age-grade status was calculated for the children of each age for the semi-mobile white children, the mobile white children, and the non-white children. As would be expected, the general tendency was for the amount of retardation to increase with age (Table 69). There was almost no net difference between the mean retardation of semi-mobile and of mobile white children in school. The mean for the in-school non-white children, 1.3, however, was nearly twice as high as the mean for the in-school white children.

Data on grade progress for children still going to school does not, however, give an adequate picture of the degree to which children of migrant farm laborers are retarded in school. Another important part of the picture is the grade level attained by the children who

Table 69.--MEAN AGE-GRADE RETARDATION OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL, BY AGE, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

(The number of cases from which each mean was calculated appears in parentheses to the right of the mean. A minus represents being underage)

Age	White Children			Non-white Children
	Total	Semi-mobile	Mobile	
Mean	0.7 (178)	0.8 (92)	0.7 (86)	1.3 (42)
7	-0.2 (11)	-0.3 (6)	0.0 (5)	0.3 (3)
8	0.1 (14)	-0.3 (6)	0.5 (8)	-0.3 (6)
9	0.7 (14)	0.8 (6)	0.6 (8)	0.7 (6)
10	0.2 (22)	0.3 (11)	0.1 (11)	1.0 (8)
11	0.7 (18)	0.5 (11)	0.9 (7)	0.0 (1)
12	0.6 (21)	1.3 (11)	-0.1 (10)	1.0 (1)
13	0.9 (22)	0.8 (12)	1.1 (10)	2.7 (6)
14	1.3 (16)	0.8 (8)	1.8 (8)	1.4 (5)
15	0.9 (14)	1.1 (6)	0.8 (8)	1.5 (2)
16	2.6 (10)	2.0 (8)	5.0 (2)	1.0 (2)
17	0.8 (9)	0.8 (4)	0.8 (5)	7.0 (1)
18	0.7 (7)	1.7 (3)	0.0 (4)	--- (0)
Mean age	11.4	10.9	12.0	10.8

have quit going to school. Of the 48 children who were reported as having not attended the previous year, it is reasonable to assume that nearly all of the 32 who were over ten years of age had quit permanently. The highest grade attended, by age of child, for the out-of-school children (presented in Table 70) shows how far short of a high school education most of these children will receive.

Mean age-grade status data for the in-school and out-of-school children combined are presented in Table 71. The mean age-grade status for the white children was 1.1, showing 0.4 of a grade more average retardation than for the in-school white children. It was expected that the mobile white children, both the in-school children alone and

Table 70.--HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED, BY AGE, FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL CHILDREN

Age	Highest Grade Completed										
	Total	0	1	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11
Total	48	18	1	2	1	5	8	5	4	3	1
6	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
15	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
16	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0
17	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0
18	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	2	0
19	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1

Table 71.--MEAN AGE-GRADE RETARDATION OF ALL CHILDREN, BY AGE, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

(The number of cases from which each mean was calculated appears in parentheses to the right of the mean. A minus represents being underage)

Age	White Children			Non-white Children
	Total	Semi-mobile	Mobile	
Mean	1.1 (210)	1.1 (106)	1.2 (104)	1.5 (47)
7	0.1 (14)	-0.1 (7)	0.3 (7)	0.5 (4)
8	0.3 (15)	-0.3 (6)	0.7 (9)	-0.3 (6)
9	0.7 (14)	0.8 (6)	0.6 (8)	0.7 (6)
10	0.5 (24)	0.5 (12)	0.4 (12)	1.0 (8)
11	0.7 (18)	0.5 (11)	0.9 (7)	0.0 (1)
12	0.7 (22)	1.4 (12)	-0.1 (10)	1.0 (1)
13	0.9 (22)	0.8 (12)	1.1 (10)	2.7 (6)
14	1.3 (17)	0.9 (9)	1.8 (8)	1.4 (5)
15	1.6 (17)	1.4 (7)	1.7 (10)	1.5 (2)
16	2.7 (17)	2.1 (11)	3.8 (6)	1.0 (2)
17	1.5 (13)	1.0 (5)	1.8 (8)	7.0 (1)
18	2.5 (15)	3.3 (6)	2.0 (9)	3.0 (1)
19	5.5 (2)	5.5 (2)	--- (0)	4.8 (4)
Mean age	12.5	12.5	12.5	11.8

the in-school and out-of-school combined, would have been substantially more retarded than the semi-mobile white children because they had missed, on the average, many more days of school. The information obtained indicated almost no net difference. The writers believe, even though they lack proof, that exaggeration of the grade achievement of their children was greater on the average by mobile than by semi-mobile parents.

The mean age-grade retardation reported for the non-white children was 1.5, four-tenths of a grade more than for the white children. The accuracy of this information is not known.

Even though Greene used a more lenient definition of age-grade retardation, probably partly because his interviewing occurred while school was in session, less retardation on the average was reported in this study than in his. Combining in-school and out-of-school children, 66 per cent of the children in Greene's study were reported as retarded as compared with 56 per cent in the present study.[7] It may well be, however, that, had as accurate school information been secured in this study as in Greene's, the amount of retardation would have been as high or almost as high. Especially when school attendance laws are being violated, information from parents needs to be checked by school records. This can be done for all cases only when the interviewing is done in the communities in which the migrants spend a plurality of the school year.

---

[7] Greene, The Education of Migrant Children, p. 79.

The educational picture for children whose parents migrate to southern Illinois to pick strawberries may be summarized as follows:

(1) Some of the children, primarily in semi-mobile families, had good attendance records and no retardation.

(2) Many of the children, especially in mobile families, either missed much school during the year or had not attended at all.

(3) A majority were retarded one or more grades.

(4) Relatively few attended school in more than one community during the year, no matter how often they moved. In 1958 most of them arrived in southern Illinois during the last few days of the local school terms, but for many of them the school terms in their home communities were already over

CHAPTER VIII

ASPIRATIONS, PLANS, AND ATTITUDES

Whereas the previous chapter dealt with overt school behavior and achievement of the migrant children, this cahpter deals with a wide variety of covert behavior of the migrants. How do migrants regard education, their occupation, their problems? What are their hopes and plans? Such questions are generally omitted from studies of migrant farm laborers. Even though the validity of information of this type gathered through direct questioning is often low, several such questions were included in this survey because of the intrinsic importance of attitudes.[1] Certainly, how migrants view their world should not be totally ignored, whether one is attempting to understand their problems or to reduce the seriousness of their problems.

Concerning Their Children

The education of their children

When asked what was the highest grade they would like to see their children finish, the parents of nearly two-thirds of the children in school specified the twelfth grade (Table 72). The parents of almost a third claimed they would like to see their children finish college. The initial response of many of the latter, however, was not in those terms. Such expresions as "as far as pollible," "all the way," and "plumb through" were used.

---

[1] 1. When the direction of bias or exaggeration in the responses is obvious, worthwhile information can often be salvaged through using the "at least" or "not less than" form of interpretation. Too, answers which do not represent underlying attitudes may be of interest as indicators of what people believe will sound good.

As anticipated, more of the semi-mobile white children's parents than of the mobile white children's parents indicated that they would like their children to get a college education. The percentage of non-whites stating they would like their children to go through college, 37, was somewhat higher than the percentage for the whites, 31.

Table 72.--HIGHEST GRADE DESIRED BY PARENTS FOR CHILD, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Highest Grade Desired	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	227	184	43	95	89
9-10	1	1	0	0	1
11-12	139	114	25	54	60
13-14	6	4	2	2	2
15-16	68	52	16	29	23
17 & over	3	3	0	3	0
No information	10	10	0	7	3

As a check on the validity of the responses to the question regarding the highest grade the parents would like to see their children finish, the following follow-up question was asked: "Would you prefer that he go that far instead of taking a good-paying job if he can get it?" Excluding the 12 cases for which no reply was received, for four-fifths of the children in school the answer was affirmative--

the parent would prefer that his child remain in school. This is by no means, of course, a foolproof check on the validity of the previous question, but the negative answers are probably accurate and indicate that the answers of many Negroes as to how far in school they would like their children to go are not meaningfully accurate. A majority of the Negroes were from the deep South, many from Mississippi, and the well-known tendency for these Negroes to give the kind of answers to attitude questions asked by whites which they think will most likely please the whites, apparently accounted for many of the responses as to how much education they wanted their children to receive. Only 58 per cent of the non-whites as contrasted with 85 per cent of the whites replying indicated that they would prefer that their children turn down a "good-paying" job in order to complete the educational goal they had claimed they wanted their children to attain (Table 73).

In contrast, about 90 per cent of Class Ia, Ib, and IIa white

Table 73.--PARENT PREFERS THAT HIS CHILD "GO THAT FAR" IN SCHOOL INSTEAD OF TAKING A GOOD-PAYING JOB, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Class	White Children			Non-white Children		
	Total	"Yes" Answers		Total	"Yes" Answers	
	Answers	Number	Per cent	Answers	Number	Per cent
Total	175	148	85	40	23	58
Semi-mobile	93	83	89	24	17	71
Ia	43	39	91	7	7	100
Ib	50	44	88	17	10	59
Mobile	82	65	79	16	6	38
IIa	28	26	93	--	--	--
IIb	54	39	72	16	6	38

cases said they would prefer to have their children complete their stated educational goal rather than quit school to take a "good-paying" job. The responses for the Class IIb white cases was intermediate, 72 per cent preferring their children to remain in school. This is further evidence that a higher proportion of mobile than of semi-mobile white parents do not have a strong interest in having their children receive a good education.

When the parents were asked what the highest grade was that their children would like to finish, the reply for nearly a sixth of the children was that they (the parents) did not know. Nearly three-fourths of the remainder indicated that completion of high school was as far as they thought their children wanted to go. Not quite 18 per cent of the children wanted to go through college, according to their parents. Two per cent were reported to not want to complete more than the ninth or tenth grade and three per cent not more than the eighth. Although the reported amount of education desired by the children was less than what the parents desired for their children, in most of the cases no difference was reported.

A smaller per cent of white than of non-white children were reproted by their parents as wanting to go through college. This may merely mean that more of the Negro than of the white parents gave the kind of reply they thought would "sound good" or be desired by the interviewers, whom they knew to be "college people."

Almost two-thirds of the children in school were reported by their parents to like school very much, 19 per cent much, 11 per cent some, and 5 per cent little or not at all. There is no way to find out how many of the children were reported to like school better than they actually did. In at least an occasional case in which the parent reported that the child liked school very much the principal or superintendent of the school the child attended reported that the child had a very poor attitude and lacked interest in school work. A higher per cent of non-white than of white children were reported by their parents to like school very much, but this cannot be accepted as representing more genuine liking of school by non-white than white children. No substantial net difference between semi-mobile and mobile white children in liking school was reported by their parents.

On the average, according to the responses received, the highest grade the parents expect their children to complete is distinctly below the highest grade they desire their children to complete. Whereas the parent of only one child admitted he did not care to have his child complete high school, eight per cent of the children were expected by their parents not to go beyond the eighth grade and about as many more not to go beyond the tenth grade (Table 64). Also, whereas a college

Table 74.--HIGHEST GRADE EXPECTED BY PARENT FOR CHILD, BY CLASS AND RACE

Highest Grade Expected	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	227	184	43	95	89
0- 8	17	14	3	5	9
9-10	16	14	2	4	10
11-12	164	132	32	70	62
13-14	1	1	0	1	0
15-16	5	5	0	3	2
No information	24	18	6	12	6

degree was claimed to be desired by their parents for one-third of the children, only two per cent of the children were expected by their parents to finish college. Four-fifths of the children were expected by their parents, according to the replies given, to complete high school but not to go further. ,These data, of course, pertain only to migrant family children who were reported to have attended school during at least part of the 1957-1958 school year.

No non-white parents reported that they expected any of their children to go beyond high school. The per cent of non-white children who were not expected by their parents to go beyond the tenth grade was slightly less, as reported, than for whites. The writers are inclined to believe that some of the white parents, and a larger proportion of the non-white parents, stated that they expected their children to go further in school than they really expected them to. Semi-mobile white children were expected, on the average, to go further in school than mobile white children according to the parents.

Conclusions pertaining to the education of children

What conclusions (in addition to those listed at the end of the preceding chapter) can be drawn from the wide variety of data obtained, some of it apparently inconsistent, which pertain to the education of the children of migrant laborers? The writers have come to the following:

(1) Some, probably one-fourth or more, of the migrant laborers gave inaccurate answers to questions pertaining to school enrollment, attendance, aspirations, and attitudes. Laws pertaining to school attendance and to employment of children during school hours, which

are frequently violated, are an important cause of inaccurate answers. Poor memory and the tendency to give answers which are believed to be "expected" or "wanted" or are intended to avoid losing status in the eyes of the interviewer are other important causes of inaccurate answers.

(2) Many, perhaps over a half, of the migrant employees conscientiously tried to give as accurate answers as they could, and for the most part their answers were reasonably accurate.

(3) As anticipated, the only safe way to interpret the data presented, particularly the data pertaining to covert behavior (attitudes and aspirations), is in an "at least" form or its equivalent, accepting the "unfavorable" responses and assuming that an unknown proportion of the "favorable" responses are spurious. Using Table 64 as an illustration, it should be reasonably safe to state that at least 97 per cent (197 out of 203 cases reporting) of the children in school were not expected by their parents to go beyond high school and that at least 8 per cent (17 out of 203 cases reporting) of the children in school were not expected by their parents to go beyond the eighth grade. It is highly probable that the true per cent of children who were not expected by their parents to go beyond the eighth grade was substantially greater than eight per cent.

(4) The most practical, and perhaps the only feasible, design for obtaining accurate information on the schooling of the children of migrant farm laborers involves interviewing in the communities in which they spend a plurality of the school year. This would permit checking records in local schools for all the children in the sample

of families covered by the survey. A representative cross-section of all the various categories of migrant farm laborers would not be obtained, however, by this procedure.

(5) To obtain highly valid data on the educational aspirations and attitudes of migrant farm laborers and their children, rather extensive use of participant observation is probably necessary. To do this for a representative cross-section of migrant farm laborers would be very expensive.

(6) Some of the migrant workers were genuinely anxious to have their children obtain as much education as possible. Almost surely a number of them would be delighted, if they were able, to help their children through college. This conclusion is based not so much on the data presented as on unsolicited comments and the apparent earnestness with which some of these comments were made. After stating they wanted their children to "get as much education as they can," or words to that effect, many voluntarily went on to explain their answers by such statements as "you can't get anywhere these days without an education" and "I want my children to get along better than I have." Some made the statements with much apparent feeling. A few spoke with evident pride and satisfaction about how well their children were doing in school. Another indication of high regard for education is the fact that some of the semi-mobile parents waited until the last day of school in their home communities before coming to southern Illinois to pick strawberries even though picking commenced from one to four or five days earlier.

(7) Some of the migrant workers do not care much whether their children get much of an education or not. The low attendance records of many of the children is strong circumstantial evidence for this. Also, several teachers, principals, and superintendents in the home communities of the migrants expressed conviction that the migrants "didn't really care about the education of their children." Each had gained that impression from specific cases.

(8) On the average, migrant farm laborer parents, particularly the "mobile" parents, apparently do not regard education for their children as being as important as American parents in general do.

(9) The distribution of inherent mental capacity for learning is about the same among children of migrant farm workers as exists in the general population.

(10) Some of the children of migrants do very well in school, one was described as "brilliant," and obviously enjoy school, but a higher proportion than in the general population do not get along well in school and apparently dislike having to go to school.

The occupations of their children

There is no consensus among the migrant laborers as to what they would like their children to do after leaving home. Partly to find out how many would like to have their children become migrant farm workers and partly as an indirect indication of how they regarded this occupation, the migrant employees were asked what they would tell their children if the latter asked their advice on whether to choose migrant farm work as a permanent occupation. Excluding 18 cases in which the parent said he would not give advice and 24 cases in which no satisfactory answer was given, for 30 per cent of the children the reply was affirmative and for 70 per cent negative.

Migrant farm work was less popular among the whites than the non-whites. Whereas there were affirmative responses for 44 per cent of the non-whites, only 24 per cent of the responses were affirmative for the whites, a significant difference (Tables 75 and 94). The response was affirmative for roughly half as many mobile as semi-mobile white children, a difference which is not statistically significant (Table 95). Perhaps the greater mobility and related problems of the mobile whites caused more of them to regard migrant farm work as undesirable, at least for their children.

Table 75.--EMPLOYEE WOULD ADVISE HIS CHILDREN OR YOUNG FRIENDS TO BECOME MIGRANT FARM LABORERS PERMANENTLY, BY CLASS
(This table does not include 18 cases of "no advice" and 24 cases of no answer)

Class	White Employees			Non-white Employees		
	Total Responses	Affirmative Responses		Total Responses	Negative Responses	
		Number	Per cent		Number	Per cent
Total	115	28	24	45	20	44
Semi-mobile	32	7	22	10	2	20
Ia	17	4	24	3	1	33
Ib	15	3	20	7	1	14
Mobile	33	4	12	5	0	0
IIa	12	1	8	0	-	-
IIb	21	3	14	5	0	0
III	25	7	28	13	6	46
IV	25	10	40	17	12	71

For each child age ten or over the parent was asked what he would like the child to do when he left home. A majority, instead of naming an occupation, said (at least in effect) "what he wants to do" or "I don't know" or gave a vague answer (Table 76). The 50 relatively specific replies were scattered among two dozen occupations, the leading ones being doctor (7 cases), nurse (6 cases), and bookkeeper (4 cases). Farmer was mentioned only once and farm worker only three times. Low-prestige as well as high-prestige occupations were mentioned.

Plans and Attitudes Concerning Their Occupation

Plans regarding changing work

Slightly over half of the migrants said that they planned to change to some other type of work within the next two years. The

Table 76.--OCCUPATIONAL AMBITIONS OF EMPLOYEE FOR CHILDREN AGE TEN AND OVER, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN

Ambition for Children	Total Children			White Children	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile
Total	197	167	30	88	79
Professional	15	12	3	8	4
Business manager or owner	1	1	0	0	1
Office or store worker	7	6	1	4	2
Service or operative worker	13	8	5	7	1
Skilled laborer	2	2	0	1	1
Farmer or farm worker	4	3	1	2	1
Housewife	8	7	1	2	5
No preference	81	75	6	35	40
No information	66	53	13	29	24

semi-mobile whites and the Class III and Class IV non-whites were the only categories for which less than half said they planned to change (Table 77). Since some of the semi-mobile whites who said they did not plan to change were persons for whom migrant farm work was only a secondary occupation, it would not be safe to conclude on the basis of this question that semi-mobile whites regarded migrant farm work more favorably than mobile whites did. The difference between the proportions for whites and for non-whites was also far from significant (Table [illegible]).

Table 77.--EMPLOYEE PLANS TO CHANGE TO SOME OTHER TYPE OF WORK IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS, BY CLASS

Class	White Children			Non-white Children		
	Total Answers	"Yes" Answers		Total Answers	"Yes" Answers	
		Number	Per cent		Number	Per cent
Total	126	68	54	59	29	49
Semi-mobile	34	14	41	10	6	60
Ia	17	7	41	3	1	33
Ib	17	7	41	7	5	71
Mobile	36	19	53	5	4	80
IIa	13	7	54	0	-	-
IIb	23	12	52	5	4	80
III	28	16	57	14	6	43
IV	28	19	68	30	13	43

Attitude toward their pattern of life and work

Each migrant was asked if he was reasonably well satisfied with the life he led, including the kind of work he did. Seventy per cent responded that they were (Table 78). It is probable, however, that this question has low validity and the correct per cent should be considerably lower. Both the question on whether the migrants would advise their children to become migrant farm laborers and the question on plans to change type of work within two years indicated much less satisfaction with this manner of earning a living and are believed by the writers to be more valid. In addition, many of the respondents appeared to be puzzled and uncertain as to the meaning of the question. Particularly in view of hhe doubtful validity of this question, the differences between categories of employees in their responses to it are not worth pointing out.

Table 78.--EMPLOYEE REASONABLY WELL SATISFIED WITH HIS PATTERN OF LIFE AND WORK, BY CLASS

Class	White Employees			Non-white Employees		
	Total	"Yes" Answers		Total	"Yes" Answers	
	Answers	Number	Per cent	Answers	Number	Per cent
Total	135	93	69	67	48	72
Semi-mobile	35	27	77	11	6	55
Ia	18	15	83	3	2	67
Ib	17	12	71	8	4	50
Mobile	39	27	69	5	4	80
IIa	13	11	85	0	--	--
IIb	26	16	62	5	4	80
III	31	19	61	17	12	71
IV	30	20	67	34	26	77

For each child in school, the parent was also asked whether the child complained about moving from place to place and away from his playmates. Thirty-one replies were that the child did complain, 168 were that the child did not, and there was no reply for the remaining children.

Based upon comments made and impressions gained during the interviewing as well as the data in Tables 65-68, the writers conclude the following:

(1) At least half of the migrants interviewed were not satisfied with their situation, primarily because of irregular work, low income, the nature of the work, living conditions, or a combination of these.

(2) Many of those who were dissatisfied did not know how to change to a better occupation or believed that they could not. A considerable number doubtless had tried and not succeeded. Some were marginal workers who could not or would not keep a steady job.

(3) A minority of the laborers were good at harvesting seasonal crops and liked that type of work better than "inside" or non-agricultural work. They wished that more wages could be earned harvesting crops, but overall they could not be considered generally dissatisfied.

(4) The remainder fell in between these two categories and had varied combinations of the attitudes mentioned.

Attitudes Pertaining to Southern Illinois

Respondent expects to return

An indirect indication of a migrant worker's attitude toward the desirability of southern Illinois as a place for seasonal agricultural work is whether he intends to return the next year. Presumably, most of those who had strong negative reactions would not plan to return. Seventy-two per cent of the migrants said that they expected to return to work in this area next year, but a number were not sure (Table 79). A higher proportion of non-whites than whites reported this expectation,

Table 79.--EMPLOYEE EXPECTS TO RETURN TO WORK IN THIS AREA NEXT YEAR, BY CLASS

Class	White Employees			Non-white Employees		
	Total Answers	"Yes" Answers		Total Answers	"Yes" Answers	
		Number	Per cent		Number	Per cent
Total	117	78	67	52	44	85
Semi-mobile	30	21	70	7	5	71
Ia	15	12	80	3	3	100
Ib	15	9	60	4	2	50
Mobile	34	25	74	2	2	100
IIa	11	8	73	0	-	--
IIb	23	17	74	2	2	100
III	29	20	69	16	14	88
IV	24	12	50	27	23	85

but the difference may well be spurious because of the general tendency of non-whites to give affirmative responses. If those migrants who genuinely expected at the time of interviewing to return the next year but did not return were added to the number who indicated they expected to return when in fact they had no plans at all, the resulting sum might constitute a considerable percentage of those who said they expected to return. On the other hand, at least a few who did not expect to return the next year probably did return. Only 50 per cent of the white single workers reported that they intended to return to work in the area the next year. This was the category with the lowest per cent.

Most of the reasons given for planning to return the next year were economic. Many from the South considered the rate of pay to be better than in their home communities. A few said they would not return because they could not earn enough picking strawberries, but a majority of those who didn't plan to return hoped to have other, more steady employment.

Likes and dislikes

Each migrant employee was asked what he liked and what he disliked about working in the area and on the specific farm where he was picking strawberries. Nearly half of the migrants stated that they liked working in the area because they could get work there, they liked the kind of work, they liked the pay, or they gave some other economic reason (Table 80).[1] Almost a fifth said they liked the people, including the

Table 80.--LIKES CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OR EMPLOYEES

Likes	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	138	68	36	40	30	34
Wages, work	53	33	16	16	8	6
People	26	8	7	7	9	9
Countryside, climate	18	4	4	5	6	12
Nothing	23	12	5	7	0	0
Other	1	2	0	1	1	0
No information	17	9	4	4	6	7

---

[1] An occasional respondent gave more than one reason. In these cases each reason was included, causing the totals to slightly exceed the number of migrant employees. Also, the percentage and proportion figures based on Tables 70-73 which are presented in the text are omitted from the tables because of lack of space, and they are based on the total number of reasons given, ignoring the cases for which no response was recorded.

farmer and other employees, and about the same number said there was nothing they liked. Twelve per cent said they liked the countryside or the climate or both. Non-whites were a little more likely than whites to mention economic reasons, and there was very little difference between the responses of semi-mobile and mobile whites.

By far the leading reason given for liking employment on the specific farms they were on was the farmer and "the people," generally meaning the farmer and his family. Sixty per cent gave this as their reason (Table 81). Many unsolicited expressions of praise for, and liking of, their employers is additional evidence of the popularity of the farmers. Some spoke at length about how friendly and helpful their employers were. A majority apparently felt that the farmers sincerely regarded them as worthy and entitled to as much consideration as anyone else. They did not experience condescending behavior on the part of the farmers. Some referred to their employer as a "fine" man and one stated that he liked his employer even better than he liked

Table 81.--LIKES CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT ON THE SPECIFIC FARM, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Likes	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	139	68	37	39	30	34
Wages, work	19	9	5	3	5	5
Farmer, people	79	31	21	29	10	17
Housing	2	0	1	0	0	0
Nothing	22	17	5	5	10	6
Other	1	2	0	0	0	1
No information	15	9	5	2	5	5

his own brother. There was, of course, much variation among the farmers in how they were regarded by their employees, but most, at least in the Centralia-Irvington area, were unquestionably popular.

The above findings contrast sharply with a popular stereotype of the employer of migratory laborers as a heartless exploiter toward whom his employees have deep-seated antagonistic feelings. Of course the treatment of migrant farm workers may be highly satisfactory in numerous other areas, but it is the opinion of the writers that Irvington is the heart of an area which compares favorably with any other in the United States in respect to the personal treatment of migrant farm workers by their employers.[2] Further, the evidence obtained indicates that the basis for this treatment is a real interest in the workers as people and a genuine desire to help others, not just an opportunistic, this-is-the-way-to-succeed attitude.

Fifteen per cent of the migrants said that what they liked about working on the specific farm was the pay, the work, or some related economic factor. Twenty-one per cent said there was nothing they liked about working on the particular farm.

Four-fifths of the migrant employees said that there was nothing they disliked about working in the area (Table 82). Five per cent said they didn't like the work or the pay, another five per cent the housing, three per cent the water (some farms did not have piped water), and one per cent the people.

---

[2] The senior writer has had years of experience among agricultural migrant workers elsewhere in the United States.

Table 82.--DISLIKES CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Dislikes	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
Wages, work	5	3	2	0	3	2
People	2	0	1	0	1	0
Housing	7	1	1	5	1	0
Water	4	1	2	2	0	0
Nothing	89	45	25	25	17	21
Other	6	3	0	2	1	1
No information	22	14	4	5	7	10

Nearly three-fourths stated that there was nothing they disliked about working on the particular farm where they were employed (Table 83). Thirteen per cent disliked their housing, five per cent work or the pay, five per cent the water, and one migrant said he disliked his employer.

Further bases for possible dissatisfaction with employment on southern Illinois farms were furnished by responses to the question "What do you and your family like to do in your spare time that you

Table 83.--DISLIKES CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT ON THE SPECIFIC FARM, FOR SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Dislikes	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
Wages, work	7	2	1	4	1	0
People	1	0	1	0	0	0
Housing	18	4	2	8	6	3
Water	8	1	2	3	2	0
Nothing	80	42	23	20	18	21
Other	3	1	1	2	0	1
No information	18	17	5	2	3	9

cannot do here?" Fishing, mentioned by 42 employees, led the list. Hunting, swimming, and watching television were next, each mentioned by about a dozen respondents. Seven non-whites stated that they would like to be able to earn additional income in their spare time. A variety of other answers were given by six or fewer migrants apiece. Two Negroes in one community wanted to play pool but could not because of their race.

In summary, although the rate of earnings in picking strawberries in southern Illinois was low by most standards, apparently more of the migrants considered it attractive than considered it unattractive. At least, it was employment, fast pickers could save most of what they earned while working, and for many the rate of pay was higher than comparable work in their home communities. Although most people, including some of the migrants, considered the nature of the work unattractive, some liked the work and others didn't seem to mind it. Some objected to the housing or the water, and only two employees stated that they liked their housing. Several liked the countryside or the climate. The farmer himself was the outstanding basis given for liking their jobs.

Attitudes toward community treatment of migrants

Three questions were asked to try to obtain some idea of how the migrants thought that the people in the community regarded them. To what extent the general tendency to give "agreeable" answers biased the responses given is not known, but the writers believe that it was not extensive, at least for the whites. Also unknown is the extent to which their reaction to their employers as distinct from other residents of the communities was included in their responses.

The first of the three questions was "In general, how do you feel that migrant workers in this community are treated?" "Very friendly" was the response of 45 per cent and "somewhat friendly" was the response of 46 per cent (Table 84). None considered that the migrants were treated "very unfriendly" and less than two per cent considered they were treated "somewhat unfriendly."

Table 84.--HOW EMPLOYEE FELT HE WAS TREATED IN THE COMMUNITY, BY SELECTED CATEGORIES OR EMPLOYEES

Community's Treatment	Total Employees		White Employees		Single Employees	
	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	135	67	35	39	30	34
Very friendly	57	31	17	22	8	14
Somewhat friendly	60	31	12	14	17	17
Neither friendly nor unfriendly	10	3	3	0	4	2
Somewhat unfriendly	5	0	1	3	0	0
No information	3	2	2	0	1	1

The second question was "How do you think people in this community feel about migrant workers?" Sixty-one employees either did not answer this question or said they did not know and the replies of the remaining 141 were classified as follows: appreciate migrants--24 per cent, friendly--42 per cent, all right--13 per cent, tolerate migrants--16 per cent, do not like migrants--5 per cent (Table 85).

The third question was "In regard to how migrant workers are treated, how does this community compare with others you have worked in, not counting your home community?" A little over half of those who expressed an opinion replied that there was no difference (Table 86). Thirty per cent considered the treatment either "much better" (14 per cnet) or "somewhat better" (16 per cent). Nine per cent considered it

Table 85.--WHAT EMPLOYEE THOUGHT COMMUNITY RESIDENTS FELT ABOUT MIGRANT WORKERS, BY SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Community's Attitude	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Appreciated migrants	34	22	12	6	8	3	5
Friendly	59	30	29	5	7	8	15
All right	19	14	5	3	4	2	4
Tolerated migrants	22	18	4	3	4	6	0
Don't like migrants	7	5	2	2	0	2	1
No opinion or no answer	61	46	15	16	16	9	9

Table 86.--OPINION OF EMPLOYEE CONCERNING COMPARISON OF THIS COMMUNITY WITH OTHERS, BY SELECTED CATEGORIES OF EMPLOYEES

Comparison of Community	Total Employees			White Employees		Single Employees	
	Total	White	Non-white	Semi-mobile	Mobile	White	Non-white
Total	202	135	67	35	39	30	34
Much better	25	17	8	3	5	5	3
Somewhat better	27	18	9	3	7	3	7
No difference	94	58	36	15	16	9	18
Somewhat worse	16	14	2	1	5	6	0
Much worse	11	9	2	4	4	1	2
No opinion or no answer	29	19	10	9	2	6	4

to be "somewhat worse" and at least six per cent to be "much worse"

Following the first, and also the third, question, the respondent was asked the basis for his response. Their responses, in general, were consistent with the responses in Tables 80-85 and constituted a partial validation. The responses to open-ended questions did not always fit best the question asked at the time. but generally were relevant to at least part of the schedule, Although by themselves they were of limited value. the open-ended questions in the schedule constituted a useful supplement to the structured questions and were of assistance in interpreting the data.

Differences between whites and non-whites and between semi-mobile and mobile whites regarding their treatment by community residents tended to be small.

Summarizing for this section, which has findings consistent with the preceding section, most of the migrants were favorably impressed with how the local residents acted toward them, but many considered that better facilities were previded in some other states, especially Michigan and Florida. To be spoken to in a friendly way, personally remembered and welcomed back, and treated like other people, apparently more than counterbalanced inferior physical facilities in causing half or more of the migrants to regard favorably the southern Illinois communities in which they worked.

Attitudes concerning problems of migrants

Each of the 202 migrant employees was asked what he and his family considered to be their chief problems when working or looking for work away from home. A surprising number, 63, responded that they had none, or none in particular, or did not know. The type of problem most often mentioned was economic. Fifty-six stated that their chief problem was finding work, finding enough work, gaps in between jobs, short hours of work caused by bad weather, low rate of pay, or insufficient income.

Living conditions were mentioned almost as frequently. Nearly 50 migrant employees said they considered poor living conditions or finding housing to be one of their major problems. A majority of these complained about what they had to live in. Poor cooking facilities, absence of refrigeration facilities, poor water supply, inadequate or no laundry facilities, and lack of conveniences were also mentioned. A few said that finding a place to live before picking started was a problem.

Transportation was the third most frequently mentioned problem. Seventeen complained about the cost or discomfort of traveling from one employment area to another or about the difficulty of getting to town and back during their non-working hours. Health was specified as a problem by six and at least two or three associated it with the poor diet resulting from inadequate facilities. Three complained about being separated from their families and three mentioned problems connected with schooling for their children.

When the migrant employees were asked what they thought could and should be done to decrease their problems, half of them had no suggestions to offer. Many others gave responses which were very general and vague. For example, four merely said they needed more money without even implying how. Seven recommended that wages or the rate of pay be raised and five thought that the United States Employment Service could be more helpful.

Improvements in quality of housing and in living facilities constituted the only other category of recommendations suggested by more than two migrant workers. Twenty-four said that there should be better houses, bigger cabins, or more cabins and four of these suggested state regulation of housing. Seventeen mentioned one or more types of facilities they thought should be provided, or provided more adequately. These facilities included better stoves, pure water, running water, more and better toilets, showers, washing machines, and refrigerators. These suggestions for improvement were not aimed solely, or probably even primarily, at conditions in southern Illinois, where most of them stayed less than three weeks.

From the viewpoint of the migrants, then, inadequate earnings and poor housing and facilities constituted their leading problems and were the only areas in which more than a few made suggestions for improvements.

CHAPTER IX

THE EMPLOYING FARMERS AND THEIR FARMS

The farmers who employ them, as well as the migrant farm laborers themselves, are a potential source of information about these laborers and problems associated with their employment. In this chapter findings from the interviews with farmers are presented. As explained on page six, the 63 farmers interviewed include 33 in the Centralia-Irvington area who produced three or more acres of strawberries in 1958 (all of whom employed migrant pickers) and 30 farmers in Union County. The latter included 21 farmers who produced either no strawberries or less than three acres of them in 1958 but did employ migrant workers for harvesting one or more other crops, as well as nine growers of at least three acres of strawberries apiece. The Union County farmers interviewed were not representative of all in the county who employed migrants, farmers with large acreages being overrepresented.

Size of Farms and Chief Crops

There was a large range in the size of the farms. Ten were under 80 acres in size, 34 between 81 and 240 acres, 16 between 241 and 640 acres, and 3 were over 800 acres.

Number of cultivated acres is probably a more meaningful indication of the size of a farm enterprise. Sixteen out of 58 farmers had less than 80 cultivated acres, 28 between 81 and 240 acres, 11 between 241 and 480 acres, and 5 over 640 acres. The largest farms are clearly very large and all would be classified as commercial farms.

Of the 47 farmers who grew strawberries, 20 had not over 10 acres, 16 between 11 and 25 acres, and 9 over 25 acres. In use of seasonal labor the next two most important crops were peaches and apples. Nine of the 22 Union County farmers who grew peaches had over 25 acres of peaches and 10 of the 16 who grew apples had over 25 acres of apples. Both require far less labor per acre for harvesting than do strawberries. Although the total acreage of apples exceeded that of peaches, fewer pickers are needed, largely because picking extends over a longer period of time, and a smaller percentage of apples are picked by migrants.

Age, Tenure Status, and Education of the Farmers

As is typical in the United States, the 63 farmers interviewed were older on the average than the general employed population. They ranged in age from 22 to 69 years. Five were 65 to 69 years of age and 33 were 45 to 64 years of age.

Almost all were either owners, part owners, or tenants of close relatives. Only one rented from a non-relative and two were managers. Eight owned part of the land they farmed, usually most of it, and 41 owned all of the land they farmed. Seven were renting from relatives, usually parents, and tenure status was not obtained from four.

Eight of the 63 farmers had graduated from college and 11 had completed at least one year of college. Eighteen had completed high school, 19 had not gone beyond the eighth grade, and the remaining seven quit between the eighth grade and completion of high school.

Employment Practices of the Farmers

How migrant employees were obtained

The farmers obtained their migrant workers in a wide variety of ways. The most used method, both from the standpoint of the number of workers obtained (1,372) and the number of farmers using it (44), was for the workers to arrange with the farmer in advance by mail to work for him (Table 87).[1] Nearly all of these workers who arranged ahead of the picking season to work for a grower had worked for that grower before. Virtually all of the remainder were friends or acquaintances of those who had previously worked for the farmer. Nine of the growers--all from the Centralia-Irvington area, where this method was by far the most popular--said they obtained every one of their migrant workers in this manner. It appeared that the cream of the migrant

---

[1] Data which are simple totals for the three categories of farmers should not be considered as representative for southern Illinois or for the two geographic areas in southern Illinois in which these farmers live, chiefly because of the differences between these categories. As explained on page six, the Union County large farms included all farms on which considerable numbers of migrants were believed to be employed, the Union County small farms were selected as a 20 per cent sample of the farms on which presumably smaller numbers of migrants were employed, and the Centralia-Irvington area farms included farms on which three or more acres of strawberries were produced but, unlike the Union County farms, data for other crops than strawberries were excluded. Totals for the three categories of farms were omitted from Table 87 for the above reasons and in order to focus attention on the interesting differences between the categories.

Table 87.--HOW FARMERS OBTAINED MIGRANT WORKERS, BY CATEGORY OF FARM

(The number of farmers who used each method appears in parentheses immediately following the number of workers)

How Farmers Obtained Migrant Workers	Number and Per cent of Workers on: Centralia-Irvington Area Farms		Union County Small Farms		Union County Large Farms	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Total	2,211 (33)	100	390 (13)	100	1,616 (17)	100
Workers who came to farm or to farmer and asked for work who had:						
Worked for him before	396 (14)	18	35 (5)	9	295 (13)	18
Not worked for him before	138 (10)	6	71 (5)	18	326 (7)	20
Workers who arranged with farmer in advance by mail to work for him	*1,099 (26)	50	56 (4)	14	217 (14)	13
Through Employment Service	395 (18)	18	94 (10)	24	114 (9)	7
Workers brought by crew leaders who made advance arrangements with farmer	114 (2)	5	52 (3)	13	342 (9)	21
Friends, neighbors, etc. sent workers	*20 (4)	1	33 (9)	8	**68 (9)	4
Farmer went to town and asked for workers	14 (2)	1	49 (8)	13	254 (6)	16
Through "pickers needed" sign on highway	35 (1)	2	0		0	0

*Excludes workers obtained in this manner by two farmers who didn't know how many.
**Excludes workers obtained in this manner by one farmer who did not know how many.

workers obtained their jobs this way. It was from this category that most of the praise for the farmers came. The degree to which an atmosphere of friendliness and trust prevailed appeared to be positively correlated with (1) the proportion of the migrant workers who arranged in advance for their jobs and (2) the proportion of the workers who came in family units, and inversely correlated with the number of workers employed.

The next most used method by which the migrants secured jobs was the old-fashioned one of going to the farm and asking for work, hoping to be able to start work immediately. In the Centralia-Irvington area three-fourths of these had worked for the farmer before whereas on the Union County small farms only one-third had. On the Union County large farms a slight majority of the migrants using this method had not worked for the farmer before.

The next most used procedure for securing jobs on the 63 farms was through the Employment Service, which has Farm Placement offices for farmers and migrant workers in Anna, Ashley, and Centralia. Technically, jobs obtained through crew leaders should also be considered as obtained through help of the Placement Service because all of the crew leaders registered with, and were assisted by, the Placement Service. Had there been no crews, it is likely that many more jobs would have been obtained directly through the Employment Service. In addition, it is probable that numerous jobs which the farmer reported as being obtained by some of the other methods, particularly by the worker coming to the farm to ask for work, were situations in which the migrants obtained leads to the jobs either directly or indirectly from the Employment Service. When the Employment Service assisted in job placement, as a rule it sent the workers to the farm, but occasionally the farmer went to the Employment Service office and offered work to those who were there waiting for work.

While only two farmers in the Centralia-Irvington area made use of crew leaders, nine operators of Union County large farms did, and 21 per cent of all employees on Union County large farms secured their jobs through crew leaders.

The data on jobs otained through friends, neighbors, etc. sending workers to farms are unreliable because sometimes this occurred without the employing farmer knowing it.

One farmer obtained pickers by placing a "pickers wanted" sign near the highway. Another farmer said that in the past he occasionally has had radio stations in the "Bootheel" of Missouri broadcast announcements that he needed pickers.

Most of the farmers admitted being helped by the Employment Service. Thirty-three said they were helped at least once a year and 17 more said they were seldom helped. Some of the 17 said that they seldom asked the Employment Service for workers only because they seldom needed to. Eleven said they never asked the Employment Service to send workers, and an answer was not secured to this question from two farmers.

Whom the farmer employs

All but three of the Centralia-Irvington area farmers said that they employed only English-speaking whites. One of these also employed Negroes and two also employed "Mexicans." In Union County, 15 of the farmers employed both Anglo-whites and Negroes, one employed Anglo-whites and Latin Americans, and two said they employed all three categories. Twelve employed only Anglo-whites.

As a rule, farmers who employ more than one of these categories provide segregated living quarters. One who did not had bitter complaints by a few of the Anglo-whites, particularly over alleged favoritism in facilities (a new stove) furnished to a Latin American family.

Each farmer was asked "When you can get enough men workers, do you hire women fro field work (picking, etc)?" All 16 who replied that they never did were in Union County. Seven said they seldom did and 40 that they frequently did.

There were obvious differences in the way the farmers interpreted the question "When there are enough adults available, what is the youngest age of children you employ?" Apparently few if any would employ children under age 16 unless the children were accompanied by an adult. Some said that they had tried employing high school boys and the result was so unsatisfactory that they stopped. When a family applies for work, normally the father speaks for the family and for piece-work tasks the farmer apparently considers that work done by the children is for the parents and not his business. Those who reported employing very young children interpreted the question as meaning the lowest age of the children who did any picking at all. Some of the children probably picked not more than a few boxes a day, picking only when they wanted to.

The youngest age of children "employed" reported by the farmers ranged from 4 years to 18 years (Table 88). The farmers reporting the oldest minimum ages did not grow strawberries, the crop most suitable for harvesting by children.

Table 88.--YOUNGEST AGE OF CHILDREN "EMPLOYED," BY CATEGORY OF FARM

Youngest Age of Children	Total Farms	Centralia-Irvington Area Farms	Union County Small Farms	Union County Large Farms
Total	61	31*	13	17
4- 6	4	4	0	0
8	3	2	0	1
10	5	5	0	0
12-13	8	5	2	1
14-15	14	6	2	6
16-18	27	9	9	9

*Information was not obtained from two farmers.

Opinions of the Farmers

Pertaining to the employment of migrants

Having an adequate supply of pickers at the right time is a vital necessity for growers of highly perishable foods. Fifteen of the 63 growers interviewed said that obtaining enough workers was a serious problem for them, 22 said it was not a serious problem, and 26 said that for them it was not a problem. A majority of the operators of Union County small farms regarded obtaining enough workers as a serious problem, a majority of the operators of Union County large farms regarded it as not serious, and a majority of the Centralia-Irvington farmers regarded it as not a problem. All three responses, however, appeared in each category of farmers.

Only twenty of the farmers said they had ever suffered loss because of inability to obtain needed farm workers. A majority in each category, totaling 43, said they had never suffered loss because of lack of labor. One of these contended that any grower could get whatever help he needed if he offered good living conditions and would pay slightly above the going rate of pay. Few would deny that workers could not be obtained if high wages were offered and the Employment Service were given enough advance notice, but very poor quality workers and the sudden quitting of considerable numbers of employees can cause loss.

Only two of the 53 farmers answering the question failed to agree that the Employment Service was doing a good job. Even those who seldom used its services said that it was always willing to help. Confidence that the Employment Service would help them if an emergency should arise appears to largely remove one worry that often plagued growers of perishable crops prior to the establishment of that agency. A few growers said they didn't make much use of the Employment Service because at times they had obtained highly unreliable workers from it--that they didn't know what they would get when they asked the local office to send out a specified number of workers.

One of the major problems of many farmers who employ migrant laborers is the behavior of the migrants. Some migrants do things which are shocking and disgusting to people with conventional, middle-class standards, and a larger number violate less important norms. These, of course, are the migrants who are most conspicuous and leave strong impressions. They appear to constitute a higher proportion of the migrant labor force than they actually do. In fact, it is probable that many who behave the worst are far more "migrant" than "worker." Realistically, it is not justifiable to classify them as migrant farm workers because they do so little total work. A typical "wino," for example, generally will work only a few hours or at the most a few days before drawing pay and then, without giving notice, fail to return to the job. It is no wonder that some farmers who have much experience with such cases develop poor general impressions of non-residents who apply for seasonal farm work.

To obtain a better idea about farmers' opinions toward these migrants, each farmer was asked what per cent of his seasonal workers he regarded as a problem in regard to each of four aspects. The first aspect was poor quality of work, such as picking to much green fruit, bruising fruit, damaging plants or trees, etc. The answers ranged from 14 farmers reporting that none of their seasonal workers were a problem in regard to quality of work to 5 reporting percentages between 61 and 80 (Table 89). Forty reported percentages between 1 and 40.

To present the information in summary form, the average per cent of the workers who were regarded as a problem in regard to quality of work was estimated by weighting the per cent reported by each farmer by the estimated number of workers he employed during the peak of his seasonal work. This was done for each category of farm. The same was done for each of the other reported respects in which workers may have been regarded as a problem (Table 90). The Centralia-Irvington farmers regarded only 11 per cent of their seasonal workers as a problem in regard to quality of work whereas the operators of Union County large farms so regarded 38 per cent of theirs. The average for all 68 farms was 20 per cent.

Table 89.--NUMBER OF FARMERS WHO REGARDED SPECIFIED PERCENTAGES OF SEASONAL WORKERS AS A PROBLEM, BY TYPE OF PROBLEM AND CATEGORY OF FARM

Type of Problem and Farm Category	Number of Farmers Reporting the Following Percentages:					
	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100
Poor quality of work:						
Centralia-Irvington farms	12	17	3	1	0	0
Union County small farms	0	4	4	1	4	0
Union County large farms	2	4	8	2	1	0
Total	14	25	15	4	5	0
Disease, sickness and poor health:						
*Centralia-Irvington farms	23	7	2	0	0	0
Union County small farms	11	2	0	0	0	0
Union County large farms	14	2	1	0	0	0
Total	48	11	3	0	0	0
Personal Behavior:						
**Centralia-Irvington farms	14	10	2	5	0	0
Union County small farms	3	4	3	2	1	0
Union County large farms	1	4	7	5	0	0
Total	18	18	12	12	1	0
Quitting before the job is completed:						
Centralia-Irvington farms	22	3	2	1	2	3
Union County small farms	1	5	3	3	1	0
Union County large farms	0	1	9	6	1	0
Total	23	9	14	10	4	3

*This information was not obtained from one farmer.
**This information was not obtained from two farmers.

The same per cent of workers, combining estimates from all of the reporting farmers, were regarded as a problem in regard to quitting before the end of the job is completed[2] and a slightly higher per cent, 22,

---

[2] One factor causing pickers to leave before the picking is completed is that strawberry picking in Michigan begins near the end of the harvest in southern Illinois. Unless a worker has arranged in

Table 90.--PER CENT OF SEASONAL WORKERS REGARDED AS A PROBLEM BY THE FARMERS, BY TYPE OF PROBLEM AND CATEGORY OF FARM

(In calculating the percentages presented, the percentage estimates given by each farmer were weighted by the number of workers he estimated he employed during the peak of his employment)

Type of Problem	Per Cent of Workers Regarded As a Problem			
	All Farms	Centralia-Irvington Farms	Union County Small Farms	Union County Large Farms
Poor quality of work	20	11	33	38
Disease, sickness and poor health	4	6	0	1
Personal behavior	22	22	15	24
Quitting before the job is completed	20	14	31	32
Estimated peak number of workers	3,572	2,381	286	905

in regard to their personal behavior, such as stealing, not being dependable, obnoxious drinking, gambling, swearing, not bathing often enough, etc. For both, and especially the latter, type of problem, however, there was far less variation among the three farm categories.

---

advance for a job in Michigan, there may be none left there for him if he stays in southern Illinois to the very end of the harvest. Another factor is that the picking tends to be poorer during the last few days, thereby decreasing earnings. Other factors, largely personal, also cause workers not to stay to the end of the picking.

For many of his pickers to leave early can be a serious problem for the grower. It may be impossible for him to find replacements and hence a part of the crop may remain unpicked. To cope with this problem, half of the farmers said that they regularly gave a bonus for completing the job--generally paying a cent or two extra for every quart picked from the first day on. Eleven said they frequently gave a bonus, 2 seldom, and 18 never. At least one who said he never did, gave as his reason that it doesn't pay to try to keep workers after they want to leave--that they can be a source of trouble. Giving bonuses was considerably more common in the Centralia-Irvington area than in Union County.

Far fewer migrant workers were regarded as a problem in regard to disease, sickness, and poor health. An average of only four per cent were so reported. Surprisingly, whereas six per cent of the workers in the Centralia-Irvington area were reported as a problem in regard to health, only about one per cent in Union County were.

The most intriguing aspect of these data, however, is the tremendous variation among the farmers, even within each of the three categories, in the percentages they report. In the Union County small farm category, for example, three farmers reported that none of their seasonal workers was a problem in regard to his personal behavior, while two farmers reported percentages between 41 and 60 and one reported 75 per cent. Surely these extensive differences are caused partly by varying definitions used by the farmers. Nevertheless the evidence is impressive that some farmers hire a far higher percentage of "problem" migrants than others do. These data also provide further evidence of heterogeneity among the migrants and the absurdity of regarding, or treating, them collectively as a type.

There has been much concern over the quality of housing and living conditions provided migrant workers by farmers. Legislation to establish minimum standards has been passed in some states and is being considered in others. In 1969 the Illinois State Department of Public Health inaugurated a program aimed at persuading farm employers of migrants to gradually imporve their migrant housing and facilities up to specified minimum standards, if these standards are not already met.

In this survey each farmer was asked to what extent furnishing lodging or housing to his workers was a problem for him. Fourteen replied that it was a serious problem, 15 that it was not a serious problem, and over half, 34, that it was not a problem. The variation in responses among the three categories of farmers was small. Perhaps about half of the farmers already have fairly good cabins or houses for their migrant workers and there is wide range in the quality of the housing provided by the other farmers.

Regarding the education of migrant children

A few questions were asked concerning education of the children of the migrants. The first was how far the farmer thought it was desirable for the brighter children of migrant farm workers to go in school. Through high school was the reply of nearly half, 27 (Table 91). Four said through college and 13 said that they should go as far as they could. Eight indicated the eighth grade, or through grade school, and 11 gave miscellaneous, indefinite replies.

Of 54 farmers expressing an opinion, 5 said that they thought that on the average the children of migrant farm workers had as much actual

Table 91.--HOW FAR THE FARMER CONSIDERED IT DESIRABLE FOR THE BRIGHTER CHILDREN OF MIGRANT FARM WORKERS TO GO IN SCHOOL, BY CATEGORY OF FARM

How Far in School	Number of Farmers			
	Total	Centralia-Irvington Farms	Union County Small Farms	Union County Large Farms
Total	63	33	13	17
Through grade school	8	5	2	1
Through high school	27	18	5	4
Through college	4	3	0	1
As far as they can	13	2	4	7
Other replies	11	5	2	4

opportunity for a good education as other children and 49 said that they did not think so (Table 92).

Table 92.--DID THE FARMER THINK THAT THE CHILDREN OF MIGRANT FARM WORKERS HAVE AS MUCH OPPORTUNITY FOR A GOOD EDUCATION AS OTHER CHILDREN, BY CATEGORY OF FARM

	Number of Farmers			
As Much Opportunity for a Good Education?	Total	Centralia-Irvington Farms	Union County Small Farms	Union County Large Farms
Total	54	24*	13	17
Yes	5	1	1	3
No	49	23	12	14

*Nine other farmers did not express an opinion.

All but one of the 59 farmers expressing an opinion said that the children of migrant farm workers _should_ have as much actual opportunity for a good education as other children. The one who disagreed commented that, if the migrant parents move from place to place, they don't care if their children go to school or not.

When asked _why_ they thought migrant children should have an educational opportunity equal to that of other children, 35 of the 57 replying stated that everyone should have equality of opportunity or that it was a right of all American citizens. Eleven mentioned some type of need as their reason, in most cases meaning that the children had a need of an education in order to get ahead. One stated that everybody should have as much education as he can afford and ten did not give a specific reason. According to these answers, in general the farmers opposed any educational discrimination against migrant children.

A current issue is whether summer schools should be set up for migrant children where and when substantial numbers of children are in a locality during summer harvesting. Such schools have been tried in several states and hearings were conducted by committees in both houses of Congress in 1960 on bills to provide federal aid for such schools. Assuming that the idea would be new to most farmers and that the initial reaction of most of them would be unfavorable unless some fo the advantages were mentioned, it was decided to introduce bias in the wording of a question on summer schools for migrant children and then allow for this in interpreting the responses.

The wording used was "What would you think of local school rooms being made available to migrants during summer fruit and vegetable harvesting for school instruction of their school-age children who don't work, and for nurseries for their younger children, thus making it easier for mothers to help harvest crops?"

Seven out of 44 farmers said they would be strongly opposed and four said they would be opposed (Table 98). About half of these said that the migrant children would not attend. Half of the eight who said they were neutral raised objections to the idea, chiefly on grounds of cost. Nearly half of the total said they favored the idea, but nine of these qualified their answers, either doubting that more than a few migrant children would go, or expressing concern over the transportation problem and the cost. Five indicated that they strongly favored the idea. It appeared that most of the farmers thought that summer schools for migrant children would be a good idea if enough children attended, but that many were skeptical, particularly about attendance and the cost.

Table 93.--OPINION OF THE FARMER TOWARD HAVING LOCAL SCHOOL ROOMS MADE AVAILABLE TO MIGRANT CHILDREN DURING SUMMER FRUIT AND VEGETABLE HARVESTING, BY CATEGORY OF FARM

Opinion of Farmer	Number of Farmers			
	Total	Centralia-Irvington Farms	Union County Small Farms	Union County Large Farms
Total	45	15*	13	17
Strongly favor	5	1	1	3
Favor	21	8	5	8
Neutral	8	1	4	3
Opposed	4	2	1	1
Strongly opposed	7	3	2	2

*Information was not obtained from 18 farmers.

If summer schools for migrant children were established, a large majority of the farmers wanted them to be financed by state or federal, not local, funds. Six favored state funds, 18 federal funds, and 9 either or both of these sources. Only three thought the money to teach and supervise these children should come from the local school district, two from the farmers who hire the migrant parents, two from the migrant parents, and one from the employers and the parents. Three farmers said they did not know where the money should come from and 19 farmers were not asked this question. Heavy local school property taxes seemed to be the chief basis for favoring federal or state financing of such summer schools.

Regarding migrants and the community

When asked whether migrant laborers ever went to the farmer's church, 15 farmers indicated that they did and 39 that they did not. The remaining nine farmers either did not know or did not themselves attend church.

When asked whether they thought those migrants who belong to the farmer's denomination should be encouraged to go to the farmer's church, 47 farmers agreed and 3 disagreed. One who disagreed said that the migrants were in the community only one Sunday, one said to let anyone go if he wants to, and the other said that no one should have to be encouraged to go to church.

One question designed to get some indication of the reaction of other residents of the community to migrant farm workers was included. Eighteen of the farmers said they thought that, if some migrants did go to the farmer's church, they would probably be cordially welcomed by the congregation, 33 farmers said they thought the migrants would be politely welcomed, 4 said they thought the migrants would be ignored, and 2 said they thought the migrants would be made to feel unwelcome. The distribution of answers was similar for each of the three categories of farms.

Some migrants, especially single men, go to town each day after work, spending much of their money and leisure time in taverns. This helps perpetuate the unfavorable stereotype many townspeople have of the migrant workers. To get the reactions of farmers toward migrants going to town, each farmer was asked if he thought migrants should be discouraged from going to town and then asked to give the reason for his answer. Only four said that they thought migrants should be discouraged from going to town, giving as their reason that the migrants get drunk or in trouble and that it would be better for them to stay out of town. They did not mean to imply, however, that migrants should be prevented from going or that it was not all right to go to town for "legitimate" reasons.

Fifty-one farmers said the migrants should not be discouraged from going to town, 29 stating that it is a right of citizens and inferring that no one had the right to interfere with their going to town, Twelve mentioned that migrants needed to go to town. Most of the farmers did not purchase day-to-day supplies for the migrants. Apparently most of the farmers interpreted the word "discourage" to mean interference or putting considerable pressure on laborers not to go to town, because a number who were opposed to discouraging their going to town expressed disapproval of migrants going to town to drink, gamble, etc.

A common problem among migrants is that they are wanted when their labor is needed but not welcome to remain afterwards. Many are citizens without a community and without a state. They are expected to go back to where they came from--which is simultaneously many places and no place for the more mobile. Where, for example, does a hobo come from? It appears that even those communities in which migrants spend a majority or all of each winter have low regard for the migrants and wish that they would go elsewhere.

The farmers interviewed in this survey were asked whether they thought migrant farm laborers should move on out of the community as soon as their farm work was over, and comments were solicited. A large majority, 48, said that the migrants should leave the community after the harvesting is completed. Apparently the chief reason for this opinion was that there was work elsewhere, especially in Michigan, but enough for only a few in southern Illinois following harvesting of the major crops. Six who thought the migrants should move on specifically mentioned that relief costs would be increased if the migrants did not move on. A reason which was not mentioned, but undoubtedly was one basis for not wanting the migrant workers to remain, was housing. Certainly the farmers would not want harvest employees to remain indefinitely in the buildings on their farms--most farmers consider that they have more than enough problems as it is--and there is very little other housing available in these small communities.

Eleven farmers gave conditional answers or were uncertain. Most of these approved migrants staying in the community if they could find work, but thought they ought to move on otherwise. It is probable that few, if any, of the 48 farmers who said they thought the migrants should leave following the harvest would object to those staying who could find work.

Two farmers disagreed with the majority opinion. One said that it was up to the individual farm workers to decide whether they should move on and the other said that the workers should not be run off because the employers are through with them.

Regarding migrant farm workers in general

One direct, general question concerning farmers' evaluation of migrant laborers was included in the farmer schedule. Each farmer was asked, what, in general, he thought of migrant farm workers. Somewhat surprisingly, 20 answered that they were honest, good workers or words to that effect and 10 more said that the migrants varied in quality but that most of them were good workers or that on the average they were superior to local farm laborers. Fifteen farmers rated the migrant workers as average, meaning that those who were below average were counterbalanced by those who were above average.

Eleven farmers said that the workers varied in quality, but that there were more below average than above average, and three farmers did not qualify their low evaluation of the migrants. One of the latter farmers referred to the drinking of the migrants and two referred to them as low class, referring to moral qualities more than to economic status.

These variations among farmers in their evaluation of migrant farm workers are reasonably consistent with the wide variation from farm to farm in the types of migrants employed. Despite the fact some of the migrant farm laborers exhibit qualities which are in sharp contrast to approved middle-class standards or norms, it appears that most of the farmers interviewed regarded many of the migrant workers favorably and did not look down on them.

CHAPTER X

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Discussion of Issues

The preceding six chapters have been largely confined to the reporting of data. Information and opinions beyond what was covered by the schedules were also obtained. Respondents were encouraged to talk and to express their feelings, hopes, and attitudes, and many did. In fact the primary objective of some questions which probably lacked high reliability was to elicit answers which provided interviewers good opportunities to ask explanations of brief answers given. Classification and tabulation of most of this additional information was not feasible, but numerous impressions, some quite strong, were formed.

The chief objective of this chapter is to present ideas and impressions gained from this survey, from other surveys, and from other sources and experiences, which pertain to highly controversial opinions and issues of current concern relating to migrant farm labor in the United States. In doing this the writers have strived to remain objective, aware of the difficulties of doing so. They have no vested interests at stake or axes to grind.

No attempt will be made to give a comprehensive treatment of the issues or topics concerning which there are wide and strong differences of opinion. Instead, potentially important aspects, implications, and possible effects which are frequently overlooked by partisans, of several proposals pertaining to migrant farm laborers and problems associated with their employment will be presented.

Why are migrant farm laborers the lowest socio-economic category of large size

Why migrant farm laborers are so disadvantaged a category is not an issue in the same sense as most of the topics discussed below because there is, of course, no proposed legislation concerning it. It is, however, a question concerning which widely divergent opinions are held and these opinions tend to influence what position a person adopts toward controversial proposals affecting migrant farm laborers.

A common explanation of the low economic and social status of migrant agricultural workers is that they are inferior--that they have low mentality, low character, serious vices such as being alcoholics, or a combination of these. At the very least, these workers are considered to be seriously lacking in such qualities as ambition, initiative, perseverance, and dependability. There is some basis for this explanation. Undoubtedly a higher proportion of those migrants who apply for seasonal farm work than of the general labor force are inferior in one or more of these respects. Although no one knows what the proportion is, certainly a substantial proportion of these migrant applicants for farm work basically are not migrant farm laborers. Farm work for them is relatively incidental and, through choice, they engage in it only a fraction of the days that they could. If these "unemployables" and sub-marginal sporadic "workers" are excluded, the proportion of migrant farm workers who are inferior in terms of American middle-class norms still may well be higher than in the general labor force, but it may be much lower than many people realize.

It is the opinion of the writers and many others who have had considerable association with migrant farm laborers who work when work is available, that a substantial majority of them, at least of those with families who accompany them, have character traits and perhaps mental capacity within the normal range, though they are generally deficient in education and industrial skills. In the course of the interviewing of both the laborers and the farmers, it appeared that many of the workers were of good character and that some were clearly superior in this respect. Taking into consideration their general lack of education and industrial skills, migrating to obtain far more work than is available to them in their home communities represents initiative, and their willingness to work, even at tiring work and low pay, contrasts very favorably with non-migrants satisfied to live in poverty or on relief. That some of the migrants were reported by their employers to wait until the last day of work available on the farm to collect nearly all of their wages certainly indicates that some possess a degree of frugality which far exceeds what is typical in the United States.

In the preceding paragraph it was suggested that migrant workers who travel without families, most of whom have no immediate family, on the average are inferior to those having families with them. Considerable evidence of this came to the attention of the interviewing staff. Drinking and gambling were rampant during non-working hours among single workers on some of the farms. The farmers, whose concern is not confined to the work performance of their workers, heartily disapproved and tried to keep such behavior within bounds, but felt largely helpless about the problem. It was disheartening to them not only to have to collect and dump large quantities of empty beer cans, whiskey bottles, etc. but also to know that so much of the wages was spent in such ways and that some of their workers were virtually as poverty-stricken when they left as when they arrived.

This situation was most noticeable on farms where there were crews of Negroes. This was partly because of discrimination against Negroes in some towns, causing Negroes to engage in such behavior largely on the farms, while the whites to a far larger extent tended to go to town to indulge in their vices.

In view of the behavior of many Negroes who come in crews, why do the farmers employ them instead of whites? Several reasons were given by the farmers. One is greater dependability. When a Negro crew leader agrees to furnish a specified number of workers for the strawberry harvest, he does so or at least comes very close to doing so. At the worst a few of the crew may desert the crew before all of the picking is completed. Leaving early is not common because the crew leader usually furnishes transportation and can provide help in emergencies. If a member deserts the crew and has little money, he is likely to face formidable problems, including finding employment. Whites, on the other hand, who generally do not come in crews and have their own means of transportation, feel much more independent and free to leave if they suddenly decide they want to.

Another reason some farmers use Negro crews is that their work performance on the job tends to be satisfactory. Most of them do not seem to mind the type and conditions of work and do not, at least apparently, do a lot of complaining and sowing seeds of dissension among other employees. In general, the housing on the farms having crews is inferior to the housing on farms not having crews. This may be a reason why the farmers who employ crews can not obtain enough of the dependable and better white workers. The most undesirable, from the standpoint of farmers at least, of the whites apparently are considered to be definitely inferior to the Negro crews in behavior. For one thing the Negro crew leaders help "keep things in hand" on the farms even though they are lenient in off-hours. It is a big help to the farmer not to have to supervise each worker personally. Without the services of the Negro crew leaders, who seemed to be capable and dependable, it appears doubtful that many Negroes would have been employed by the farmers. A few farmers volunteered the information that by far the worst employees they had ever had were what they called "poor white trash" or "white trash." They referred not to economic *poverty but to moral character and wholesale violation of mores, by no* means confined to inebriety, theivery, and adultery. A few white migrants were referred to as unbelievably filthy.

It is incorrect to infer from statements made above that all Negro employees were improvident and lacking in qualities considered virtuous. Some appeared to be highly respectable, temperate, and provident. One Negro employee was happy to have a separate house for his family so that they would not have much contact with the low-class employees. He was alert and appeared very anxious that his children become successful, respected, middle-class citizens. Another stated that his chief complaint was the foul language that his wife and children were exposed to.

If, as asserted, inferior personal qualities of the migrant farm laborers constitute a completely inadequate explanation of the low socio-economic status of these migrants, there must be other causes. Economic trends and factors are among the most important. The rapid adoption of modern "scientific" agricultural practices, including extensive mechanization, has greatly decreased both the number of farmers and the number of regular farm jobs, and, at the same time, has increased total production, which tends to increase the demand for short-time seasonal work at tasks which have not to date become satisfactorily mechanized. Since in addition the farm population more than reproduces itself, this means that hundreds of thousands of young people raised on farms have had, in recent years, to either leave agriculture altogether or to become migrant farm laborers in order to obtain employment.

Since large numbers of them are poorly educated and unprepared for non-agricultural employment, it is not surprising that many have chosen to help fill the demand for seasonal farm jobs, primarily harvesting. Despite the fact that some farmers occasionally have experienced a shortage of satisfactory workers available at the time needed at the "going" rate of pay, in general the supply has exceeded the demand. In an occupation in which neither labor unions nor legislative bodies have set minimum rates of pay, it is only natural that wage rates will be low when the supply exceeds the demand. The low rates of pay are, of course, evidence in themselves that enough laborers will, regardless of how willingly, work at these rates.

Another economic factor tending to keep wages of migrant agricultural workers low is the unmitigated intensity of competition among fruit and vegetable growers. These growers have received neither governmental subsidies nor price benefits which result from governmental restrictions on production. On the contrary, acreage restrictions on other crops may well have tended to increase competition in fruit and vegetable production. This competition has been so keen that large numbers of the less efficient and smaller-scale growers have been forced out of production. If accurate data on profits, as figured by industrial firms and economists, of all fruit and vegetable growers were known, the narrowness of the margin most of these farmers operate on would probably amaze most business men. Most farmers feel that they have no choice but to sell at prices buyers offer and to buy what they need at prices which others set, often under conditions of restricted production and minimum prices set by manufacturers.

The great increase in agricultural mechanization and efficiency has, for most fruit and some vegetable crops, been largely confined to non-harvesting operations. Therefore, harvesting costs have become a higher and higher percentage of the total cost of producing some crops. This means that growers of these crops feel under strong economic pressure to keep harvesting wages to a minimum. Whether they feel sorry for their pickers or not, they consider that they cannot raise wages and keep on producing crops which require a lot of seasonal labor. These are some of the economic reasons why wages for seasonal farm work are very low. Combining this with the extensive amount of seasonally caused unemployment among migrant farm workers easily accounts for the generally very low income, and hence economic status, of these workers.

Interestingly, wage rates for picking cotton are probably even lower than for picking fruit but not for the same set of reasons. Cotton has been under the federal farm subsidy and acreage restriction program and cotton picking has been sucessfully, but not completely, mechanized. The very efficiency of cotton picking machines has put the farmer in the position where he will pick by machine unless laborers will pick for a low rate. Hence the laborers are faced with the unattractive choice of picking cotton at low piece rates or not picking at all at a time of the year when other work is particularly scarce--as far as they are concerned almost non-existent.

There are numerous cultural, social, and psychological factors which contribute to the low social status of migrant farm laborers. Only a few will be mentioned. Several of the chief criteria used in determining the prestiga and social status of persons in our culture are criteria in which migrant laborers rank at or near the bottom. As mentioned earlier, migrants in general are very poorly educated. Associated with this is their poor speech and grammar. Most migrants wear cheap work clothes, often in poor condition and very dirty, partly because of lack of laundry facilities. Most of them either do not possess "white collar" clothes or else do not take them along when they migrate. The type of work and hours and conditions of work are unattractive and looked down on by most Americans. This, as well as the low pay, probably accounts to a considerable extent for the refusal of most youths residing in areas having seasonal farm work to work at such jobs. Body odors resulting from manual labor in the hot sun and infrequent bathing is not the least of the factors contributing to the low status of migrant agricultural workers and the aversion of many people to them. Many migrants have never acquired the habit of custom of bathing frequently, but, for even those who have, the absence of normal facilities for bathing is a serious deterrent to bathing often.

Our political institutions contribute to the low socio-economic status of migrant laborers both directly and indirectly. There is no other occupational group of considerable size in the United States which has so few of the rights which normally accompany citizenship. Many migrants are so mobile that they can not qualify anywhere either as voters or for various types of welfare assistance. Most of them are not covered by the Federal Social Security program, including Old Age and Survivor's Insurance. Minimum wage laws and state unemployment compensation laws do not apply to farm employment, and most migrants are not directly covered by any form of accident insurance. Not being voters, at least in almost all communities in which they work, they are not able to put any pressure on politicians and legislators to look out for their interests. As Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois said in an address to the National Conference to Stabilize Migrant Labor, in Chicago on November 22, 1959, there are no votes to be gained by supporting legislation to help migrant farm laborers. Local, as contrasted with federal, governmental control of many functions is a cherished American institution and certainly has its merits, but it is ill-suited to provide for the needs of persons who are mobile.

Another reason for the low social status of migrants is their lack of identification with any community. The more mobile they are, the less they consider themselves to be a part of any community and the less they are considered by others to be a part of the local social system. Failing to participate in organizations, except possibly churches, most migrants live only on the periphery of the American social system and typically are regarded as outsiders.

Since social status is accorded people to a considerable extent on the basis of wealth and income in our society, the inferior economic position of the migrant workers is also a major factor causing them to have low social status.

Thus it is highly probable that the very low socio-economic status of migrant farm workers is primarily caused not by inferiority on the part of the workers themselves, only a minority being markedly inferior, but by a wide variety of economic and cultural trends and factors.

Should the number of domestic migrant farm workers be reduced?

Many people believe that, even though efforts to improve the situation of migrant farm laborers are worthwhile, to a large extent their problems are inherent in their migrancy, and that the best approach is to reduce the number of domestic migrant farm workers. One proposed way of doing this would be to establish industries in the localities where important numbers of migrants obtain short-term seasonal farm employment. These industries would close down during the periods of peak farm employment so that their employees could help harvest the crops. There has been little, if any, success along this line. Unless the industries are compensated for temporarily closing down or are under the control of the farmers who employ seasonal workers, they will not close down. As a matter of fact, peak farm employment and peak nonfarm employment in agricultural communities tend more often to coincide than to alternate. Even if industries did lay off workers during periods of maximum seasonal farm work, there is much evidence that most of those laid off would spurn the farm laboring jobs available, particularly if wage rates were much below that of their nonfarm work.

Another approach to decreasing the number of domestic migrant farm laborers is to entice many of these laborers into nonfarm employment. This could be done through our economy operating at relatively full capacity with plenty of fairly attractive nonfarm jobs available. Education, including adult education, could also help migrant farm workers secure other work. It is probable that the further children of migrant farm laborers go in school, the more likely they are to abandon farm work for nonfarm work. Occupational guidance and training for industrial and technical jobs, whether a part of the regular school program or not, could assist. Adult education courses and some types of extension service programs also could. For those whose personal problems of adjustment keep them out of nonfarm employment, good case work could be very helpful. This would require more professionally trained case workers and probably higher salaries for case workers.

Another approach to decreasing the number of domestic migrant farm workers is to reduce the number of seasonal farm jobs available.

This could be done by increasing mechanization of harvesting operations or by further displacement of domestic seasonal farm workers by importation of more workers from Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America.

The major issue at hand, however, is not how to decrease the number of domestic migrant farm workers but whether it is desirable to do so. Obviously, whether or not it is desirable depends largely upon what the consequences would be for those leaving this occupational category, including their children, and for others affected by the change. Whether or not it is desirable also depends upon the degree to which the disadvantages associated with the existence of a large domestic migrant farm laborer working force can and will be reduced without decreasing the size of this working force. No one knows this. An increasing amount of effort and legislation is being aimed at accomplishing this and some progress is being made. It appears probable, though, that to a considerable degree the problems are an inherent consequence of the migrancy of the workers and their families. It will be assumed that this is so in the discussion to follow.

If there is a reduction in the number of domestic migrant farm laborers, will those who cease this type of work be better or worse off? If they find an equivalent amount or more of nonfarm work and do not make too unsatisfactory social and psychological adjustment to their new mode of life, they will of course be better off. On the other hand, if they obtain considerably less employment per year and rely to a greater extent upon relief (public welfare assistance), they will probably be worse off. They will likely lose self-confidence and self-respect, which many still apparently retain, and suffer general demoralization and personality disintegration. This would tend to weaken the control of the parents over their children and the gain made in less schooling lost through migration might be offset by higher rates of juvenile delinquency.

Two other categories of persons likely to be affected by a reduction in the number of domestic migrant agricultural workers are the employing farmers and the industrial laborers who would experience increased competition for their jobs. Considering the farmers first, a general reduction in the supply of domestic laborers seeking seasonal agricultural employment would tend to force wages upward unless more foreign workers were imported. If those who quit seeking farm work were the most undependable and unsatisfactory of the workers, the farmers might gain. The Employment Service would then be able to provide better average quality of workers and would probably be used more by farmers than it now is. If those who quit seeking farm work were largely the superior workers, one of the major problems of the employing farmers would be intensified.

A transfer of many migrant farm workers to nonfarm jobs would naturally increase the competition for these jobs. If the transfer occurred during a time of a labor shortage in the types of work to which the migrants shifted, the increased competition would probably have very little adverse affect upon these other workers, at least until employment opportunities decreased. If the transfer occurred while substantial unemployment existed in these types of work, the average number of days of unemployment per worker, and probably the amount of unemployment insurance income per worker, would increase.

The desirability, therefore, of a reduction in the number of domestic migrant farm workers would depend upon the conditions, only the more important of which have been mentioned here, under which hhe reduction occurred. Without knowing or assuming specific conditions and consequences, it would be impossible to answer the question satisfactorily.

Should minimum wage rates for farm work be established?

For years one of the most controversial issues pertaining to the employment of agricultural laborers has been whether to pass minimum-wage legislation covering farm labor. Support for such legislation by Congress had by no means been confined to labor unions, but what is called the "farm bloc" has succeeded in preventing passage..

What are probably the chief reasons for the opposition of most farmers to minimum wage legislation covering their employees have already been presented on pages 162 and 163. The farmers feel they simply can not afford to pay substantially higher wage rates--that such legislation would force them out of business. If such legislation were passed by state legislatures, that could easily happen to many farmers in the states which passed such laws or set higher minimum rates than prevailed in states producing the same crops. It would alter the competitive position of some farmers in comparison to that of others. But passage of federal minimum farm wage rates would be different matter. If such legislation established differential rates in line with present regional differences in average seasonal farm wage rates, the relative competitive position of the farmers to each other would remain substantially unchanged. But this would involve official recognition, and support, of regional inequalities and its adoption is therefore questionable, except possibly if automatic provision were made for gradual elimination of these inequalities.

Before discussing the probable effects of a flat national minimum wage law applying to farm work, brief attention will be given to another factor which is probably helping delay such legislation. It is the details which would have to be worked out that would be necessary to make the law administratively feasible without creating unintended and unwanted problems. Probably most hand harvesting of fruits and vegetables is done on a piece-work basis. This is because of great variation among workers in how fast they work and also in how much time they waste. For the same quality of work, fast pickers are a big advantage over slow pickers for the farmer. If piece-rate work were abolished, threat of firing would be about the only pressure the farmer could exert over loitering workers and growers of highly perishable crops harvested largely by migrants can not use this effectively on a large scale. Replacements may not be available. It is conceivable that the average number of units picked per worker per hour would be less than one-half as high under hourly-rate pay as now exists under piece-rate pay. This might add more to the cost of production than whatever increase in piece-work rates would be necessary to raise wages to an average of $1.25 per hour. Certainly, careful attention should be paid to potentially important details in drawing up a minimum-wage law for agriculture.

If Congress passed a law providing that every farmer had to pay wages which would on the average come to \$1.25[1] per hour per worker, what would be the consequences?

An immediate effect would be an increase in the cost of producing most, if not all, crops picked by hand. For some crops the percentage increase would be high, perhaps 25 to 50 per cent or more. Would this increase be absorbed by the farmer, or the middlemen who handle these crops, or passed on to the consumer, or would some portion be borne by each? Will the consumers decrease their consumption of these foods, chiefly fruits and vegetables? It is the opinion of the writers that most, after a brief transitional period perhaps nearly all, of the increase would be passed on to the consumer. It is he, not the farmer, who is reaping the advantage of present low wage rates in agriculture. There are always farmers willing to try to make a living producing these crops and many keep on even when their earnings are very low. Where there is such severe competition, a relatively uniform increase in the cost of production tends to increase the price which many farmers will have to demand or discontinue production. If many discontinue production, the ratio of supply to demand will decrease and competition among buyers for the short supply will force prices up. Consumers may be shocked by the sudden sharp rise in fruit and vegetable prices, but most of them tend to adjust to such changes rather rapidly when alternative products of the same general type do not remain at the lower level, as was the case during World War II.

---

[1] One dollar per hour per worker, ninety cents, or even less, could be the initial rate set.

The farmers who would be most adversely affected would be those who had to raise their wages the most. Since farm wage rates are lowest in the South, the brunt of the adjustment might fall on farmers there. Growers in northern and western states might be as well off as now if their costs of production rose less than the costs of their competitors in the South.

Fundamentally the plight of the farmers is not determined by the general level of the wages they pay. It is determined by their tendency to produce more, rather than less, as farm prices sink lower, whereas other industries reduce production when prices become very low. Because of the intense competition among farmers, as a rule it is only by being more efficient and working harder than his fellow producers that a farmer can make a profit. Even then he might not.

The above analysis is presented primarily as a stimulation to fuller consideration of the probable consequences of passing minimum-wage, and similar, legislation, not as by any means a definitive treatment of the subject. It is an area of research to which well qualified agricultural economists might well devote more attention and research.[2]

There are other consequences that could result from federal minimum farm wage legislation, especially if the minimum is not low. On is that farmers who do not now do so might start charging rent for the living quarters they furnish. This might result in the amount of rent being higher for the better accommodations. It might also result in more of the migrants obtaining housing off the farm and relieve some farmers of the problem of providing housing, or as much as at present, for their workers. This would be of most help to farmers who employ migrants for only a month or less each year, as many of the operators of the smaller commercial farms do.

---

[2] Shortly after the above was written, Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers, prepared by Harry S. Kantor with the assistance of Cora S. Cronemeyer and Francis L. Hauser, United States Department of Labor, was received. Including the Statistical Appendix, the report is over 500 pages long and is an illustration of the type of investigation and analysis recommended by the writers. Included among the many possible features, problems, and effects considered is the possibility of applying minimum wage requirements only to farms that are substantial users of hired workers. If this were done, a minor part of the above discussion would, of course, be irrelevant.

Another possible effect is that considerably larger numbers of local people might be enticed into engaging in seasonal farm work. If able-bodied people on relief and on unemployment compensation could obtain much higher income working for local farmers, at least some of them who would otherwise be unemployed would probably get harvest jobs. If they didn't, it would indicate a need of competent case work. High school, even college, youths might no longer regard such work with contempt. As fewer migrants became needed, problems associated with the employment of migrants would decrease, at least in most communities. Even the costs of local relief might go down. The net cost to farmers of a federal minimum-wage law covering their employees might inded be much less than expected.

Should the employment of Mexican nationals be reduced?

Perhaps the most controversial issue, or at least the one on which the most effort is being exerted on both sides of the issue, relating to employment of migrant farm workers which is now before

Congress centers around the proposed extension of what is known as "Public Law 78." This law provides for the importation of Mexicans under specified conditions, including wage rates prevailing in the area of their employment for similar work, guarantees of opportunity to work at least three-fourths of the work days in the contract period, transportation to and from the job site, free housing (meeting minimum standards) and bedding, and free occupational insurance providing subsistence during days of illness or injury. It was first adopted in 1942 to make up for the severe shortage of farm labor due to the war. Not over 63,000 Mexicans were brought in during any one year of World War II. Since then the number has greatly increased and in 1959 over 430,000 were imported.[3]

Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation and some other organizations of farmers want to extend the law and to restrict certain powers of the Secretary of Labor. Various church organizations, labor organizations, consultants to the Secretary of Labor, civic committees and organizations, and private citizens interested in migrant farm labor problems are backing proposed legislation which would terminate Public Law 78 in five years, each year decreasing the number of Mexicans who can be imported by 20 per cent of the current number, and clarifying certain powers of the Secretary of Labor designed to protect the interests of farm laborers who are citizens of the United States.

---

[3] Information Letter Number Nine, National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York 3, New York, June, 1960, p. 2.

Since much literature is available concerning this issue, leading arguments on both sides will be presented in only summary form. Major claims presented by those who favor continuation of the importation of workers from Mexico are:

(1) There are not enough American citizens willing to harvest all of the crops grown by American farmers, at least at the wages the growers are able to pay.

(2) To discontinue importing Mexican nationals will result in consumers having to pay higher prices for their food.

(3) The present program is beneficial to Mexico, which has much unemployment and needs more American dollars, and to the workers who come to the United States to harvest crops. Obviously, the Mexican Government must favor the program or it would discontinue the agreement with the United States providing for it and the Mexican workers must consider that they gain or they would not apply to come.

Leading arguments presented by those who favor termination of the program, at least gradually, include the following:

(1) Importation of Mexican workers keeps wage rates from rising as they otherwise naturally would during peak periods of demand for agricultural labor.

(2) It results in unfair competition to American workers, whose position in our socio-economic structure is very low at best. No other category of American workers is forced to compete directly with foreign workers having low levels of living. Further, foreign workers are guaranteed rights which are not guaranteed to native Americans.

(3) There are plenty of Americans willing to harvest our crops, at

least at wage rates which would prevail were it not for the importation of Mexicans willing to work for as little as fifty cents per hour. Unable to obtain employment in Texas, California, Arkansas, Arizona, and New Mexico during peak harvest periods, sometimes even at very low rates of pay, large numbers of farm workers feel forced to migrate northward in search of employment, thereby swelling the ranks of migratory farm workers and having a depressing effect on wage scales where they go.

(4) Family farmers who perform all or a considerable proportion of the labor on crops harvested elsewhere by cheap foreign labor are injured by having to compete with large-scale growers, including corporation farms, who have low production costs due to the low wages they pay the Mexican nationals. The cheap labor also causes overproduction, which further depresses prices farmers can obtain. The importation of Mexican workers is hence given as one of the causes of the decline in the number of family farms in the United States since World War II.

(5) The importation of Mexican workers is harmful to these workers and creates feelings of resentment against Americans. The contention is that the Mexicans are exploited by being paid low rates, that not all employers abide by all the contract provisions, and that the separation of the workers from their families is detrimental to family life.

If federal minimum-wage legislation applicable to agriculture were passed, interest in the importation of foreign workers issue would doubtless decline.

Should summer schools for migrant children be established?

Bills are now before Congress, and committee hearings have been held on them, which would provide federal assistance for five years for the education of the children of migrant farm laborers. The provision which will be considered here would grant funds to states for the purpose of setting up and conducting summer school sessions for children of migrant agricultural employees. Only operating costs could be paid for out of federal funds.

It is contended by proponents of this proposed legislation that there is no possibility of more than a very small fraction of the needed number of summer schools for migrant children being established and operated unless the federal government pays most of the cost. If we assume for the moment that a large number of such summer schools scattered over numerous states are necessary, then the evidence is indeed impressive that federal aid is needed. Not that all of the states have failed to take constructive action in this direction. A few, including Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Oregon, have, at least on a trial basis. But the resistance in local communities where considerable numbers of migrants are employed to using local tax funds to conduct special summer schools for the migrant children is formidable and economy-mindedness is likewise not foreign to most legislatures. Many might be willing to provide small sums for such schools, but to expect them to pay most of the costs of a fairly comprehensive summer school program for migrant children appears unrealistic. It appears that the choice is between federal support or very few such schools.

Now let us turn to the question of whether such schools are desirable--whether what they would accomplish would be worth the financial cost. There are several arguments in favor of these schools. One of the most important is that on the average migrant children do not have educational opportunities equal to those of non-migrants. That roughly half or more of them are retarded at least one school grade is ample evidence of their being disadvantaged. Migrancy directly accounts for much of the retardation. It is largely beside the point to argue that dislike of school work may cause part of the retardation, or that unfavorable attitudes of their parents toward education may also contribute. The retarded children are still retarded and the fact that their parents are migrant farm laborers is a part of the complex of causes, direct and indirect, of that retardation. In our culture the amount and quality of education is increasingly a major determinant of a person's opportunities and success as an adult.

Not only the inadequately educated child but also our society and general welfare are adversely affected by the inadequate education. The poorly educated have virtually no chance of making major contributions to our culture and the poorer their education the less productive they will be and the greater the probability that they will be a net liability to society. The amount of welfare assistance, public or private, one receives is inversely correlated with the amount of education he has had. Hence it is to the best long-run interests of all of us, irrespective of the attitudes of their parents, to have children of migrant farm laborers, or anyone else for that matter, obtain as good an education as possible considering their mental capacity.

One of the chief arguments against summer schools for migrant children is the contention that few of them would attend such schools, either because of their own attitudes or their parents' attitudes. Without recruitment efforts that may be true. In the summer schools for migrant children which have been conducted, attendance apparently would have been very poor had it not been for earnest, conscientious efforts to get the children to enroll and attend, and to make the school experience, by and large, a pleasant one. To be successful, these schools probably must have superior teachers and school authorities genuinely interested in helping the migrant children. Free transportation and school lunches furnished for a nominal charge, or free, are also important. There have been enough successful summer schools to show that success is possible.

Another basis for opposition to summer schools for migrant children is the argument that they would be too expensive for what would be accomplished--that the children would be too diverse in their backgrounds and needs and remain in one locality too short a period of time to make these schools feasible. That they would cost more per day per child than regular school, in some cases much more, is probably true. To be reasonably effective the classes would have to be small. This runs up the cost. However, overhead costs would tend to be less per pupil because no new classrooms and facilities--very expensive items--would be needed and some teachers would be willing to teach for less than their normal pay in order to obtain supplementary income during their three-month involuntary vacation without pay. In the summer schools there is not as much opportunity for certain types of unpleasant experiences, such as being teased about their poor clothes, as during regular school terms. The overwhelming opinion of those who have had experience supervising or teaching in special summer schools for migrant children is that the children have profited from these schools and have been at least as well behaved after a brief adjustment period as the local children during the regular school term. If a person considers that helping these disadvantaged children is less important than refraining from adding the cost to our tax bills, he is of course entitled to that opinion. Proponents of these summer schools sharply disagree, of course, and believe that in the long run there may be no net additional cost to the taxpayers.

Another basis for opposing summer schools for migrant children is that children are needed to help their parents harvest the crops Farmers need to get their crops picked and the migrant families have such low annual income that they need whatever extra income the children can earn. Their need for extra income is clear. If they can earn a substantial amount and at no net disadvantage to themselves and society, many people would favor permitting this. Some would even encourage it. Others, however, are convinced that child labor, whether in industrial plants or on farms, inherently tends to have more harmful than desirable consequences. Many crops harvested partly by migrants are not suitable for child labor, particularly children under 14 years of age and sometimes under 16 or more years of age. Agriculture has become one of our most dangerous occupations, having high accident rates. For such crops probably most farmers would be happy to have all but the grown children off the farm during working hours. Having idle children around can be a big worry to busy farmers who use much machinery. For the children to go to summer school would be an advantage to the farmer under such circumstances. There are some crops, strawberries being a good example, in which about the only machinery used during harvest is trucks for hauling from the farm and which children, expecially the older ones, can harvest about as easily as adults. For these crops, it would be primarily a matter of balancing the benefits of summer school classes against the immediate contribution the children could make as workers. During the regular school terms our society has decided that the education of the children is the more important.

Should there be further child labor legislation?

Whether to prohibit child labor in agriculture is another lively issue facing Congress. A specific proposal, together with others affecting farm laborers, on which committee hearings have been held is to remove the exemption which applies to agricultural labor from the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The effect would be to prohibit all agricultural employment of children (exept on the farm of a child's parents or guardian) under 14 years of age and all agricultural employment of children 14 or 15 years of age except for employment which the Secretary of Labor determines as not interfering with the schooling, health, or well-being of the children. If this were to become law and be rigidly enforced, it would have much effect because evidence from all over the United States indicates tht large numbers of children under 14, as well as 15 and 16, years of age obtain some agricultural employment. The United States Census Bureau estimated that in July 1957 there were 221,000 children

14 to 15 years of age inclusive and 236,000 children 10 to 13 years of age inclusive working for pay in agriculture.[4] Unpaid family workers 10 to 15 years of age inclusive employed in agriculture were estimated to number 1,050,000. No estimate was made of the number of children under 10 years of age who worked on farms.

Proponents of this legislative proposal claim that employment of children tends to be detrimental to the children and to society--that most, or at least large numbers of, children who work for wages are disadvantaged in one or more ways by employment. It can interfere with education, it can cause injury through accidents, overwork can have harmful physiological effects, it can deprive children of normal opportunity other children have to play and the socializing effects of this play, and in the case of migrants it can involve substandard and unhealthful living conditions. This is a formidable list.

Many of those who oppose the proposed legislation concede that these effects can occur but claim that there is much farm work which can be performed by children without any of these consequences. They also point to potential advantages of children working at what they consider suitable tasks. One is that migrant laborer families, particularly if they are large families, have very low annual incomes and are in great need of whatever additional income the children can earn. With this additional income the children can be given more nutritious meals, better clothes, more medical attention, occasional toys, etc.

---

[4] Migratory Labor (Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 86 Congress, 1 Session, Washington: 1960) p. 33.

Also, they will have the maturing experience of learning how to work.

An additional factor to consider, if children were prohibited from working, is how they would then spend their time. Presumably a considerable number of the migrant laborers would continue to migrate and take their families along. If there were no school in session in the locality where work was found, the children would be idle and often unsupervised in a community away from home. This is considered to be a situation conducive to juvenile delinquency. Would they not be better off working? Some migrant laborers would probably seek work by themselves, leaving their families at home. This tends to weaken family bonds. Some might leave the younger children with relatives and the parents and older children migrate. This could result in inadequate supervision of the younger children. Some of the migrants would probably abandon migrant farm labor. What would happen to them? If they managed to find more regular employment, in nearly all cases they would probably be better off. But, if they did not, they would suffer more intense poverty, to the detriment of the children being protected from "exploitation." No one knows what proportion would make up each of these types of adjustment.

If no children, or very few, were permitted to obtain agricultural work, the effect would vary greatly among different types of farming and also among the various fruit and vegetable crops. The producers of some crops would be largely unaffected whereas the growers of other crops, including berries, cherries, and some vegetables, would be greatly affected. Cotton growers who now have their cotton picked by paid hand labor would be far more affected than those who have their cotton picked by machine. The effect on the growers of hand-picked cotton would probably be similar to, but perhaps less drastic than, the effect of minimum agricultural wage legislation. Many of the growers would likely be forced to change to machine picking and those who were not able to might well be crowded out of farming altogether. Producers of small fruits could not change to machine-picking because suitable harvesting machines have not been invented. If prohibition of children under 16 from picking these crops should cause an important percentage of those families who now pick these crops to discontinue doing so, as might happen, then other pickers would have to be found or else the groweres would have to reduce or discontinue the production of these crops. If other pickers were found, most of them would probably be unmarried persons. To have large numbers of unmarried nonresidents temporarily in a community is not an ideal situation. In southern Illinois, and probably elsewhere, earnings of migrant farm laborer families appear to be spent far more constructively and usefully on the average than the earnings of single migrant workers.

Another possible effect of prohibition of children under age 16 working in agriculture is that fruit and vegetable growers who hire migrant workers but not large numbers of them--operators of what are called family farms--might be affected more adversely than either large-scale or very small-scale farm operators. It is easier for large-scale operators to arrange for crews of single laborers, whether native or Mexican, and those farmers who hire no labor (and produce only an insignificant proportion of the crops on which migrants work) could not be adversely affected except as employment of their children on other farms was reduced or stopped.

It is recognized that the child labor bill being considered by Congress provides for the granting of exceptions for 14- and 15-year old children at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. Many exceptions could be granted and how many would be can not be known in advance. For one thing, whenever a new Secretary of Labor took office there could be a major change of policy.

Some people favor a middle course between no further legislation and passage of the bill under consideration by Congress. The idea would be to prohibit child labor which now exists to the detriment of children, such as during regular school terms, without prohibiting children from contributing to family income under relatively favorable conditions. Apparently the chief objection to this approach is based on administrative problems. Relatively sweeping legislation, permitting administrators to decide what exceptions are to be made and how and under what circumstances, is apparently the easiest to enforce. It is the clear intent of present laws, federal and state, to prohibit agricultural employment as well as any other type from interfering with the education of children. Enforcement, however, is difficult and by no means completely effective, but not because of lack of conscientious efforts of federal personnel to enforce present laws.

It should be mentioned that the probable effects of each of the four legislative proposals discussed would be altered by passage of the others. For example, extension of minimum wage laws to agriculture would probably reduce the number of Mexican laborers imported and the number of children who help harvest crops, thereby decreasing the effect of terminating the importation of Mexicans or of extending the coverage of child labor laws to agriculture. Likewise, further extension to agriculture of child labor laws or adoption of minimum-wage legislation applying to agriculture would weaken opposition to establishment of summer schools for migrant children and tend to increase the effectiveness of such schools. The issues interlace and should be considered together if a wise decision is to be made.

Should legislation setting housing standards be adopted?

There has been a strong trend in recent years in favor of governmental action aimed at improving the housing of migrant farm laborers, particularly through setting minimum standards. Some states, notably Michigan, which now rates comparatively high in quality of housing for migrants, have passed such legislation.

On some issues, the federal government has a natural advantage in legislating, but in housing legislation it appears that the states do. The chief basis of opposition to housing legislation for migrant farm laborers is the cost to the farmer, whose financial condition often is poor. Especially when the standards set are moderate and sufficient time is given to meet them, the farmers tend to gain some return on their investment through being able to attract better quality workers and having the good workers satisfied enough to return in subsequent years, which is an advantage to the farmers. Hence any tendency for such state legislation to put the farmers in that state at a competitive disadvantage with farmers in states without such legislation is mitigated.

Nevertheless, it should be recognized that even modest standards are difficult for some farmers to meet fully. Unfortunately, one of the most important aspects of housing and facilities is relatively expensive--plumbing and furnishing safe water. Having access only to contaminated water is one of the most serious hazards migrants may encounter. The modest amount most children can earn in the short period it takes to harvest most crops will not go far in paying doctor bills if members of the family become sick. Access to adequate shower and laundry facilities can be important in improving both the status and the self-respect of many migrant laborers. They have more real need of these than office workers, who are far more likely to have them. It may surprise many people to know, however, that even today some farmers who employ migrant workers do not have modern plumbing in their own homes and no piped water on their farms. They still use open wells and obtain water for drinking and household use by bucket. A few such cases were encountered in southern Illinois.[5] If the farmers thought they could afford modern plumbing, surely they would have had it. If it is true that they cannot afford it for themselves, how could they afford to obtain it for migrant workers who spend about two weeks a year on their farms and who may not have it back home where they spend the winter months? Hence, rigid standards could easily force some farmers either to abandon farming or shift to producing other crops, on which it might be even more difficult to make a modest living.

---

[5] Water from a well may be safe for the farmer and his family, who have built up immunity to the bacteria it contains, yet cause enteric disorders when drunk by others. Also, use of a common drinking cup may cause spread of disease from one person to others.

There is a bill before Congress which would authorize loans to farmers for construction and repair of housing for migratory workers. If passed, it would of course make it easier for many farmers to provide better housing for their migrant workers and accelerate improvement in this housing. If prices received by farmers for their crops which are harvested by migrants remain as low as seems likely, however, paying back these loans may be very difficult.

During the depression, the Federal Government built a number of housing camps for migrant agricultural workers and operated them for several years. These were far superior to what was then normal and were widely praised. They fell victim to the post-World War II movement to get the government out of competition with private business and were sold. For many farmers who employ migrants only very briefly, either a revival of such a program by one or more levels of government or some type of cooperative camps would be a much more economical and feasible way of providing adequate quality housing and facilities for the migrant employees of these farmers. That way the same facilities could be used over and over again in one season in many agricultural communities, thus involving far less overhead per worker per day of use for better housing and facilities. Unfortunately, cooperative ventures of this type are extremely difficult to arrange and keep going.

This discussion of leading issues pertaining to the use of migrant farm laborers, it should be repeated, is far from adequate. Many minor proposals and even some major proposals, such as regulation of crew leaders and of interstate transportation of migrant farm workers, as well as innumerable details, have been omitted altogether. It is hoped, though, that enough has been presented to stimulate objective thinking concerning the issues. Changes appear inevitable. What changes and how soon are yet to be decided.

Suggestions for Future Research

Make far more use of participant observation and case study methods

Numerous surveys have gathered statistical information of varying accuracy about migrant farm laborers and their families. The writers believe that what is now most needed is intensive rather than extensive research, designed to gain a more thorough and accurate understanding of the value systems, modes of thinking, attitudes, motivation, etc. of migrant farm laborers. A considerable proportion of the data obtained to date may be rather superficial and wholly inadequate for understanding migrants in the sense that some of the better anthropologists try to understand peoples and cultures they study. Participant observation is is probably the most valuable technique of investigation for probing for this type of information. To be used effectively, it would probably require that investigators obtain seasonal farm jobs, work alongside the migrants, and then "manage" to get in lengthy conversations with migrants during evenings. Finding qualified personnel willing to do this may be difficult.[6]

---

[6] The Migrant Citizenship Education Project, under the direction of William H. Koch, Jr., a project of The Migrant Ministry of Home Missions, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, has made some use of participant observation, but under field conditions differing from those suggested here.

Far more use should also be made of the case study method, which can of course easily be used in conjunction with participant observation. The usefulness of both the case study and the statistical-survey methods can be increased by combining the two. The latter method can be used as a basis for selecting an appropriate sample for case study investigation.

Study how and why people become migrant farm workers

Large numbers of people continue to be pushed off farms, whether they are farm operators, resident farm laborers, or children of either of these. Some go directly to nonfarm employment, some become migrant farm workers temporarily and then enter the non-agricultural labor force, some remain migrant farm workers for years, and some fail to obtain more than sporadic employment of any kind. How, and particularly why, people become members of each of these categories is a fascinating subject for research. What is not known about it far exceeds what is known. The roles of cultural, of social, of psychological, and of chance factors, and of interrelationships between these are certainly worthy of intensive investigation by well-trained social science researchers.

Search for types of migrants and reliable indices of these types

There is far too great diversity among migrant farm laborers to assume that they represent a single type. Even though the current project failed to discover types among them, surely types do exist. It appears that characteristics of a different kind than most of those used in this study will have to be studied in order to discover meaningful types among the migrant farm workers.

When these types are found and described, reliable indices of each will be needed. Characteristics fairly easy to observe by which the types can be identified will have to be found in order to maximize the usefulness of the classification of types. It may be, for example, that educational progarams which are effective for one type of migrant farm worker may have almost no appeal and effectiveness with some of the other types.

Compare migrants who keep returning to the same farms with those who do not

It may be that one of the most important bases for classifying migrant farm workers is whether or not they keep returning to the same farms for work. This does not appear to be associated with most of the characteristics of migrant laborers observed in the project for which this is the major report, but it may be closely related to a highly important complex of personality characteristics. Even if there is not sufficient clustering of characteristics related to returning to the same farms, this could still be an important and useful basis for meaningfully classifying the migrant farm workers.

Compare migrants with comparable non-migrants

In this report considerable data pertaining to migrant agricultural workers and their children were obtained, but these data were not compared with data for the general population. It was felt that comparisons with the general population on some of the traits would have added little of importance to the knowledge of most people willing to read this type of report. In school retardation of children, in income, and in days unemployed, for example, great differences are obvious.

What would be of much interest and value is a comparison of a representative or random sample of migrant agricultural workers and their children with a similarly drawn control-group sample of non-migrants who have comparable income, educational, and cultural backgrounds. Better yet would be to have two or more control groups, each representative of a different segment or category of the lower class in the United States. Perhaps one or two of the control groups should be selected from metropolitan areas. Important traits indicating basic attitudes and values, which can best be observed by use of participant observation and case history methods, should be sought for.

This could furnish scientific evidence, now so meager, concerning the importance of migration as a cause of the serious educational plight of children of migrant agricultural laborers. It might confirm that migration itself is of major importance, and conceivably it could lead to identification of more basic causes of the lack of educational attainment by migrant children. It might even provide clues concerning what changes in the content and methods of teaching children of migrant farm laborers would produce better results. Such a research project, or coordinated series of projects, would have the potentiality of producing other valuable results, including findings of theoretical importance.

Study why some farmers have far less of a labor problem than other farmers

It is very likely that the great variation among farmers in the nature and degree of their seasonal labor problems which was found in southern Illinois exists in other agricultural areas. Extensive agricultural research has been done in agronomy, horticulture, entomology, plant and animal pathology, breeding, nutrition, agricultural engineering, and other fields, including marketing and some areas of farm management. Considerable research has also been done on how to maximize the efficiency of industrial labor. But how to maximize the efficiency of utilization of agricultural workers has been neglected. Competent research in this area might be very rewarding. Much could be done without having to persuade farmers to try out new farm labor management practices because such wide variation already exists.

Find out the circumstances under which local people would harvest crops

It is anomalous that an area characterized by chronic unemployment and heavy out-migration, such as southern Illinois, should import large numbers of migrant farm laborers. Unemployed people are there, but they do not harvest the crops requiring extensive hand labor. What are the reasons? A partial answer may be that wages are low, and that one or more forms of social security provide at least a temporary alternative to acceptance of sub-standard wages. But what other factors are operative? Surely there are circumstances under which local people would harvest the crops. What are they? Successful research along this line should be of both theoretical and practical value.

Devise and experiment with procedures for rating of workers by the Employment Service.

Perhaps the greatest improvement in any aspect of the employment of migrant farm laborers since the depression is in the efficiency with which those who seek seasonal farm work and those who want farm workers are brought together. During the depression a considerable share of the workers' meager earnings were spent in finding the next job. It was discouraging to have to go from place to place, following rumors and "pickers wanted" signs and only occasionally find work, usually for a very short period of time. Now the Employment Service has a well-coordinated network of offices all over the United States ready to advise farm laborers where to find employment and to help farmers secure the workers they need.

Some farmers use the Employment Service, however, as almost a last resort because the quality of the workers sent to them is often mediocre or poor. If some feasible way could be devised whereby the Employment Service could obtain a fairly accurate rating of the workers, at least of the better ones, the Employment Service would be able to do an even more effective job. If farmers knew more about the workers available through the Employment Service, they would make more use of it. Then a higher precentage of the migrant farm laborers would also use the Employment Service than now do. Devising a feasible procedure for rating migrant workers certainly would not be easy and research might well be devoted to it. Why some migrant laborers do not make use, or more use, of the services of the Employment Service is a related question also worthy of investigation.

The above is far from an exhaustive list of suggestions for further research pertaining to the employment of migrant farm laborers. The writers have merely presented those they consider important which may not occur to most persons. Many ideas for research are implicit in the controversial issues discussed briefly and in others not discussed in this report. More studies concerning the probable effects of various proposals for legislation and what specific provisions would probably produce the best results in the long run as well as in the short run, such as Harry Kantor reported in Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers would be highly desirable. More studies having objectives like that of The Migrant Citizenship Education Project, also mentioned previously, are likewise urgently needed.

CHAPTER XI

SUMMARY

This is a survey of migrant laborers who picked strawberries in southern Illinois in the spring of 1958. Information was obtained on family composition, education, work, income, mobility, health, living conditions while working in southern Illinois, aspirations, plans, and attitudes. Special attention was devoted to the education of the children.

Although large numbers of migrants are also employed to harvest peaches, far more children are involved in the harvest of strawberries than in any other farm task in southern Illinois.

Migrants who remained in one community the nine months of the school year are classified as semi-mobile and those who did not as mobile. Other important definitions are also given in Chapter I.

The migrants who were interviewed were selected by a systematic random sampling procedure in the two areas--constituting parts of Washington, Jefferson, Marion, and Union Counties--in which most strawberries in southern Illinois are grown. This procedure worked well for the migrants who had families, but single workers were underrepresented in the final sample of 202 cases. Valuable information and assistance was also obtained from 63 cooperating farmers.

School records in the schools the migrants stated their children had attended during the 1957-1958 school year were used to check the accuracy of information about school attendance and achievement given by the migrants. Although a majority gave reasonably accurate answers, some did not.

An attempt was made to discover types among the migrant workers. None was found.

All cases

The migrant farm laborers included in this study did not differ greatly from migrant farm laborers in general in the United States with respect to sex, age, household size, marital status, or education. On the average they had only a sixth grade education and many had experienced broken marriages.

They had spent about one-third of the year prior to the interviewing away from their home communities.[1] During the year they had worked in about four localities in about three states. The 202 migrant workers came from 17 home states--including 80 from Arkansas, 41 from Missouri, 24 from Louisiana, and 12 from Mississippi.

Almost a half of the migrants had about the same migration-work patterns in the first five months of 1958 as in the same months of 1957. Though only half of the workers had migrated to the same areas for as many as two consecutive years, some had done so for many years. They had been migrant farm laborers for a total of about eight and a half total years, but for only about six and one half consecutive years.

---

[1] This and most succeeding general statements of this type are based upon means, but in most cases there is much skewness and very wide dispersion around the means. Hence an examination of the distributions is necessary in order to obtain a clear picture.

A mean of 159 days of work during the year, with no concentration in any class intervals, was reported by the 153 respondents who gave sufficiently complete information. Sixty-one per cent of the workers performed less than 101 days of farm work and 70 per cent performed less than 51 days of nonfarm work. Many of the migrants obtained either little or no nonfarm work. Most of the remainder obtained very little farm work.

Most of them obtained no more than five jobs during the year and most of the jobs lasted well under a month. Half of the total number of farm jobs during the year were obtained by arranging with the farmer in advance and a fifth were obtained through crew leaders. Only four per cent of the jobs were reported to have been obtained through the Employment Service, but this agency undoubtedly helped indirectly in a much larger percentage.

Information on how all farm jobs during the year were obtained from the 63 cooperating farmers is presented in this paragraph. Unlike most other data presented, it includes jobs of migrants not interviewed for this study, does not include jobs obtained during the year from other farmers, and was provided by the farmers rather than by the sample of farm laborers. More of the jobs on the farms were obtained by arranging with the farmers in advance by mail than by any other method. Nearly as many obtained their jobs by going to the farmers and requesting immediate employment, and half of these laborers had worked for the same farmers previously. The next most frequent method of obtaining jobs was directly through the Employment Service, which indirectly played an assisting role in some of the other methods.

Roughly an eighth of the jobs were secured through crew leaders.

The mean cash income for the year for 83 reporting families was approximately $1,750, of which roughly $1,000 was for farm work. The mean cash income for reporting single persons was approximately $875--half that of the families--and roughly two-thirds of it was for farm work. The mean earnings by children per white family with school-age children in an 18-day strawberry harvest were estimated to be $20 by children 6-9 years of age, $138 by children 10-15 years of age, and $83 by children 16-19 years of age. It should be noted that the income data means are of doubtful accuracy and usually do not represent central tendencies.

Some of the migrant children were reported never to have received any medical care. School health programs were responsible for much of the medical care, particularly vaccinations, received by most of the children.

Eighteen per cent of children 6-19 years of age were reported not to have been enrolled in any school during the year prior to the interviewing, but the correct proportion who did not enroll may have been one-third or more.

For the 82 per cent of the children reported to have been enrolled, the average reported number of days of school missed during the year was 33, and 18 of these days were missed because of migration. These data underrepresent the true situation an unknown amount. Over half of the children were retarded. Of the 224 children reported as in school, 58 per cent had completed less than a grade a year and 66 per cent were found to be overage for their grade, the mean age-grade retardation being eight-tenths of one year. Combining in-school and out-of-school children, the mean age-grade retardation was 1.2 years. Variation among the children, even within categories, was extensive. Some had good attendance and achievement records, but more had very poor attendance and achievement records.

The migrant workers said they wanted their children to go further in school than the children wanted to or than the parents expected them to go. Some of the parents strongly desired to have their children obtain as much education as possible and some apparently didn't care.

At least half of the migrants were not satisfied with migrant farm work as an occupation. Many of these, however, apparently did not know how to transfer to a more desirable occupation or were unable to do so. A minority of the migrant laborers liked at least some aspects of making a living in this manner. Over half of the migrants said they planned to change to some other type of work within two years.

Over two-thirds said they expected to return to work in southern Illinois the next year. Their reasons were primarily economic. About three-fifths of the migrants liked their current employers. Some praised their employers highly. The basis for this liking was not the facilities, which were poor in a number of cases, but the considerate, friendly, uncondescending manner in which their employers treated them. A large majority said that there was nothing they disliked about working in the area or on the farm on which they worked.

The chief problems cited by the migrants were inadequate income and poor housing and facilities. However, only a minority of the migrants mentioned these as problems.

Most of the 63 cooperating farmers employed only English-speaking whites for strawberry picking. Eighteen farmers employed Negroes and whites and only three farmers employed any Latin Americans. Most of the farmers employed both women and school-age children.

Obtaining enough migrant laborers was reported by the farmers as seldom a problem. Poor quality of the laborers was, however, a very common problem. According to the pooled estimates of the cooperating farmers, about a fifth of the workers were considered to be a problem in regard to quality of work (bruising fruit, damaging plants, etc.), about a fifth were considered to be a problem in regard to quitting before the job was completed, and about 22 per cent were considered to be a problem in regard to their personal behavior (stealing, gambling, drinking, swearing, etc.). There was great variation among the farmers in their estimates.

By and large the farmers seemed to favor equality of educational opportunity for children of migrants. Many, however, were skeptical that a sufficient number of migrant children would be sent to special summer schools for children of migrant farm laborers to make such schools feasible. If such schools were conducted, the farmers did not want them to be financed by local funds.

Comparisons between whites and non-whites

On almost every item of information obtained, comparisons were made between whites and non-whites. Differences between whites and non-whites which are of substantial size have been selected for brief presentation in this section. Differences which are small or are ...

considered to be of minor importance are omitted from textual presentation; but differences, even though small, for important variables are included in Table 94 when the data are believed to be reasonably accurate.

Arkansas was the home state of a mijority of the white migrants, with Missouri being the only other important home state. Louisiana and Missouri were the leading home states of the non-white migrants, with Mississippi ranking third.

Non-whites were more irregular than whites in their migration-work patterns. Although they had been migrant farm laborers two years longer than whites, the number of consecutive years they migrated to perform farm work was approximately the same (six and a half years) for non-whites as for whites. The number of consecutive years they had migrated to the same areas for work was far less for non-whites than for whites.

Non-white employees obtained about 100 days of farm work and 29 days of nonfarm work during the year, whereas white employees obtained about 89 days of farm work and 69 days of nonfarm work. These means do not, however, represent typical cases.

Non-whites obtained 41 per cent of all their jobs for the year and 60 per cent of their current jobs through crew leaders whereas the respective percentages for whites were only 8 and 10. Whites obtained over two and a half as high a percentage of their jobs by arranging with the farmers in advance ~~as non-whites~~ did.

The cash income for the year for the reporting families was 63 per cent as high for the non-white families as for the white families from farm work and 56 per cent as high from all work.

Table 94.--STATISTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHITE AND NON-WHITE EMPLOYEES, FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

Variables	White Employees Number of Cases	White Employees Mean or Proportion	White Employees Standard Deviation	Non-white Employees Number of Cases	Non-white Employees Mean or Proportion	Non-white Employees Standard Deviation	Difference between Means or Proportions
Highest grade completed by employee	133	6.5	3.1	64	5.6	3.1	.9
Highest grade completed by wife	99	7.1	2.7	28	6.9	3.3	.2
Number of consecutive weeks spent in home community in last 12 months	133	34.3	11.0	66	33.8	12.4	.5
Number of localities in last 12 months	134	4.3	1.7	66	3.9	2.0	.4
Number of states in last 12 months	135	3.1	1.1	67	2.9	1.0	.2
Total days worked in last 12 months	108	165.	102.	45	146.	91.	19.
Days worked as farm laborer in last 12 months	119	89.	80.	54	100.	102.	11.
Days worked as non-farm laborer in last 12 months	119	69.	103.	54	29.	7.0	40.**
Number of farm jobs in last 12 months	125	4.0	2.7	59	4.3	4.3	.3
Number of farm and non-farm jobs in last 12 months	120	5.5	4.7	54	5.3	4.3	.2
Proportion with employment pattern for 1957 similar to pattern for 1958	135	.56	---	67	.30	---	.26**
Number of consecutive years migrated to same areas	133	3.7	4.0	66	2.3	2.7	1.4*
Number of consecutive years in migrant farm labor	133	6.6	7.1	67	6.5	9.0	.1
Total years in migrant farm labor	133	8.0	8.3	65	9.8	12.2	1.8*
Proportion who would advise children to become migrant farm laborers	115	.24	---	45	.44	---	.20*
Proportion of respondents who plan to change to some other type of work in the next two years	126	.54	---	59	.49	---	.05

*The difference between the distributions is statistically significant at the five per cent level.
**The difference between the distributions is statistically significant at the one per cent level.

More non-white than white children, 19 and 8 per cent respectively, had never been vaccinated for smallpox, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, or polio or received a skin test for tuberculosis. For those who had been, the non-whites reported having received theirs more recently than the whites and a higher per cent received theirs at school.

A far larger percentage of non-white children, 70, than of white children, 41, had never had their teeth examined by a dentist.

Non-white children missed more days of school than white children, and this difference was more than accounted for by migration. Consistent with this, non-white children on the average were substantially more retarded than white children.

Migrant farm work was more unpopular among the white than among the non-white migrants.

More whites than non-whites said that they liked their current employers. This is not surprising because most of the non-whites and relatively few of the whites came in crews, a situation which reduces direct contact between employing farmers and their workers.

Comparisons between semi-mobile and mobile whites

As in the preceding section, differences which are small or are considered to be of minor importance are omitted from textual presentation here; but differences, even though small, for important variables are included in Table 95 when the data are believed to be reasonably accurage.

Over half of the semi-mobile whites spent at least 45 weeks during the year in their home communities, whereas about half of the

Table 95.--STATISTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SEMI-MOBILE AND MOBILE WHITE EMPLOYEES, FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

Variable	Semi-mobile White Employees			Mobile White Employees			Difference between Means or Proportions
	Number of Cases	Mean or Proportion	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases	Mean or Proportion	Standard Deviation	
Highest grade completed by family head	34	6.0	2.5	39	5.9	3.3	.1
Highest grade completed by wife	32	6.8	2.2	36	7.3	1.9	.5
Number of localities in last 12 months	35	3.5	.4	39	5.2	1.8	1.7**
Number of states in last 12 months	35	2.6	.6	39	3.7	1.0	1.1**
Total days worked in last 12 months	28	202.	106.	34	163.	94.	39.
Days worked as farm laborer in last 12 months	32	56.	75.	35	116.	76.	60.**
Days worked as non-farm laborer in last 12 months	30	138.	134.	37	42.	74.	96.**
Number of farm jobs in last 12 months	35	2.8	2.0	36	5.2	3.1	2.4*
Number of farm and non-farm jobs in last 12 months	33	4.3	1.9	35	6.8	5.6	2.5*
Proportion with employment pattern for 1957 similar to pattern for 1958	35	.54	---	39	.69	---	1.5**
Number of consecutive years migrated to same areas	35	3.0	2.7	39	4.7	4.7	2.0*
Number of consecutive years in migrant farm labor	35	4.6	4.4	39	8.1	6.3	3.5**
Total years in migrant farm labor	35	5.5	4.8	39	9.3	7.1	3.8*
Total days absent from school	45	17.	26.	29	39.	27.	22.**
Proportion who would advise children to become migrant farm laborers	32	.22	---	33	.12	---	.10
Proportion of respondents who plan to change to some other type of work in the next two years	34	.41	---	36	.53	---	.12

*The difference between the distributions is statistically significant at the five per cent level.
**The difference between the distributions is statistically significant at the one per cent level.

mobile whites had spent less than 25 weeks in any one community.

More of the mobile than of the semi-mobile white employees were "professional" migrant farm laborers. On the average during the year they had: (1) worked in half again as many localities, (2) worked in half again as many states, (3) gone half again as many consecutive years to the same areas for work, (4) spent nearly twice as many consecutive years in migrant farm labor, (5) spent about one and three-fourths as many total years in migrant farm labor.

The mobile white employees received over twice as many days of farm work, but less than a third as many days of nonfarm work, as semi-mobile white employees did. On the average they obtained fewer total days of work than the semi-mobile whites did. They obtained more farm jobs and more total jobs, but of shorter duration, than the semi-mobile whites.

Mobile white families earned over four times as much as semi-mobile white families at farm labor, but less than a third as much as semi-mobile white families at nonfarm labor. The average total earnings for the year were $2,063 for reporting mobile families and $1,784 for reporting semi-mobile families.

More semi-mobile than mobile white children had had their teeth examined by dentists, and a smaller percentage of examinations were at school. More semi-mobile than mobile children had also been examined by a physician.

More semi-mobile than mobile white employees said that their families would obtain more medical care than they do if it were less expensive and that they considered medical expenses a serious problem.

The amount of education the semi-mobile and white parents said that they expected their children to obtain was more than the amount mobile white parents said that they expected their children to obtain. Also, it appears that mobile white parents on the average are less concerned than semi-mobile parents about the education of their children.

Discussion, and suggestions for future research

The low socio-economic status of migrant farm workers is not primarily caused by inferiority of the workers, only a minority being markedly inferior, but by a wide variety of economic and cultural factors.

Any federal minimum wage-rate legislation covering farm workers should contain detailed provisions which take into consideration all probable consequences.

Arguments for and against selected current issues--extension of federal minimum wage-rate legislation to agricultural employment, discontinuance of importation of farm laborers from Mexico, federal assistance for summer schools for migrant children, further child labor legislation, and legislation setting minimum standards for housing of migrant farm laborers--are also presented in Chapter X.

Among the recommendations for future migrant farm labor research are: (1) search further for types of migrants, (2) study how and why people become migrant farm workers, (3) compare migrants who return to the same farms with those who do not, (4) compare migrants with comparable non-migrants, (5) study why local people who are unemployed do not harvest crops, and (6) make far more use of participant observation and case study methods in such research.

APPENDIX A

THE FARMER SCHEDULE

County__________________ Interviewer__________________ Date__________

1. Farmer's name______________________________ Farm number__________

2. P.O. Address____________________ 3. Phone no.__________ 4. Age______

5. Sex: M____ F___ 6. Highest grade completed in school______ 7. 1957

Acres: Total________ Cultivated__________ In fruit & vegetables__________

8. If 1957 unusual, acres for typical year of last five: Total________ Cultivated__________ In fruit & vegetables________ 9. Tenure: Owner__________

Related tenant__________ Unrelated tenant________ Other (specify)__________

10. 1957 Seasonal Labor Crop Information

Type of fruit or crop	Acres harvested	Production Unit	Quant.	% harvested by migrants	% migrant men with children	% migrants worked for you before
a.Strawberries						
b.Cucumbers						
c.Tomatoes						
d.Peaches						
e.Apples						

11. Seasonal Labor Crop Information for Typical Year of Last Five (if 1957 is unusual)

Type of fruit or crop	Acres harvested	Production Unit	Quant.	% harvested by migrants	% migrant men with children	% migrants worked for you before
a.Strawberries						
b.Cucumbers						
c.Tomatoes						
d.Peaches						
e.Apples						

12. Place "X" in front of crops packed at farm for # 10 & # 11.

13. MIGRANT WORKERS LIKELY TO BE EMPLOYED ON THIS FARM LESS THAN THREE MONTHS IN 1957

*Crop Week	Estimated Number Worked on Farm Any Time During the Week**					
	Men(age 16 or over)		Women		Children(under age 16)	
	Total	Negro	Total	Negro	Total	Negro
May 5-11						
May 12-18						
May 19-25						
May 26-J.1						
June 2-8						
June 9-15						
June 16-22						
June 23-29						
June 30-J.6						
July 7-13						
July 14-20						
July 21-27						
July 28-A.3						
Aug. 4-10						
Aug. 11-17						
Aug. 18-24						
Aug. 25-31						
Sep. 1-7						
Sep. 8-14						
Sep. 15-21						
Sep. 22-28						
Sep. 29-O.2						
Oct. 3-9						
Oct. 10-16						

*If the farmer can give this information fairly easily by crop, bracket the weeks for strawberries (S), tomatoes (T), peaches (P), etc. using another sheet if necessary in case of overlapping. If he cannot, omit the breakdown by crops.

**All figures for weeks following the interview will have to be estimates.

14. In the last 12 months how many of your migrant seasonal workers and family units did you obtain at least partly through each of the following ways?
    a. Workers came to farm or to you and asked for work at that time who (1) worked for you before______ (2) did not work for you before______
    b. Migrant workers who worked for you previously, arranged by mail to work for you this year______.
    c. You asked State Employment Service Office to send workers to you____
    d. You went to State Employment Service Office and offered work to workers______
    e. You went to town and offered work to workers________
    f. Friends, neighbors, etc. sent workers to you________
    g. Workers brought to your place by a crew leader or labor contractor who made arrangements with you in advance.
    h. Other ways: (specify)______________________________

15. Which of the following do you employ? Whites_____Negroes______ Mexicans(Latin Americans) ______ Others (specify)______________

16. When you can get enough men workers, do you hire women for field work (picking, etc.)? Never______ Seldom______ Frequently______

17. When there are enough adults available, what is the youngest age of children you employ?__________

18. To what extent is obtaining enough workers a problem for you? A serious problem______ Not serious______ Not a problem__________

19. Have you ever suffered loss because of inability to obtain needed farm workers? Yes_____ No_____ 20. When and how great was your loss?________________________________

21. What percent of your seasonal workers do you regard as a problem?
    a. In regard to quality of work, such as picking too much green fruit, bruising fruit, damaging plants or trees, etc ?________
    b. In regard to disease, sickness, and poor health?________
    c. In regard to their personal behavior, such as stealing, not being dependable, obnoxious drinking, gambling, or swearing, not bathing often enough, etc.?________
    d. In regard to quitting before the end of the job is completed?______

22. Do you give bonuses for completing a job or withhold any pay until the end of a job? Never______ Seldom______ Frequently______ Regularly_____

23. To what extent is furnishing lodging or housing to your workers a problem for you? A serious problem________ Not serious______ Not a problem_____ Comments________________________________

24. What ideas do you have concerning how to reduce the "farm labor problem" in this county?

25. Do you think the Illinois State Employment Service is doing a good job?
Yes______ No______ Don't know______

26. Does it help you? Never______ Seldom______ At least once a year______
Comments on # 25 and # 26____

27. How do you think its usefulness could be increased?____________________
____

28. How far do you think it is desirable for the brighter children of
migrant farm workers to go in school?_____________________________________

29. Do you think that on the average the children of migrant farm workers
have as much actual opportunity for a good education as other children?
Yes______ No______ Don't know______

30. Do you think they should have as much opportunity? Yes______ No______
Don't know______

31. Why (if # 30 is "yes" or "no")?_______________________________________

32. What would you think of local school rooms being made available to
migrants during summer fruit and vegetable harvesting for school instruction of their school-age children who don't work, and for nurseries for
their younger children, thus making it easier for mothers to help
harvest crops?
* SF______ F______ N______ O______ SO______ Don't know______
Comments____

*SF-Strongly Favor; F-Favor; N-Neutral, don't know, or uncertain;
O-Oppose; SO-Strongly Oppose

33. If this were done, where should the money come from to teach and supervise these children? The school district______ The State______
The Federal Gov't.______ The farmers who hire migrant parents______
The migrant parents______ Other(specify)______
Comments____

34. In general, what do you think of migrant farm workers?________________
____

35. Do you think migrant farm laborers should move on out of this community
as soon as their farm work is over? Yes______ No______ Don't know______
Comments:____
____

36. Do migrant farm laborers ever go to your church? Yes______ No______
Don't know______ Not applicable______ Comments______
____

37. Do you think those migrants who belong to that denomination should be encouraged to go to your church? Yes_______ No_______ Don't know______ Not applicable__________ Comments_______________________________________

38. If some did go to your church, how would they probably be treated by the congregation? Cordially welcomed________ Politely welcomed___________ Ignored_________ Made to feel unwelcome____________

39. Where do your migrant laborers buy groceries and other things they need? ____

40. Do you think they should be discouraged from going to town? Yes_______ No_______ Don't know_______________

41. Why or why not?____

42. Do you get the names of your farm workers? Yes________ Sometimes_______ No___________

43. Do you keep records of how many days each person works? Yes_________ Sometimes____________ No__________

44. Do you keep:

	by individual or family units	by crews	by all temporary workers
A. Daily records	______________	__________	________________
B. Weekly records	______________	__________	________________
C. Job records	______________	__________	________________

APPENDIX B

THE FARM LABORER FAMILY SCHEDULE

Schedule No.________________ County________________

Date________________ Interviewer________________

1. Worker's name________________ 2. Home community P.O. address

____

3. Family (Household) Composition:

Line No.	Name (First)	Relationship to head of family	Sex	Age at last birthday	Marital status	Highest grade completed
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
1.		Head				
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						

4. Have you (family head) lost any children? Yes_____ No______ If so, how many?____________

5. How many, if any, of your children have grown up and left home?

____

6. Migration and Occupational History Beginning Jan. 1, 1957, of Respondent, Line Number 3 (a) ____________ (Obtain "b" through "f" from Jan. 1, 1957, to exactly one year prior to the date of the interview; obtain "g" through "p" for the last 12 months).

Line No.	Location		Date arrived	Date left	Main Type of Work
	Locality	State			
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					

6. (continued)

Line No.	App. No. of days worked	Line numbers of members of family along	Total No. of jobs	Gross Cash Income of	
				Head or "Acting Head"	Family
(a)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
1.	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					

6. (continued)

Line No.	How many jobs (at each location) did you obtain:				
	With some help from the Employment or Farm Labor Service	Without any help from the Employment or Farm Labor Service	Through crew leader or labor contractor	By arranging in advance DIRECTLY with employer	Otherwise (specify)
(a)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)
1.	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					

7. How many consecutive years have you: (a) gone to these same areas to do farm work?__________ (b) left your home community to do farm work?_________ (c) How many of these years ("b") did some member(s) of your family go along?__________

8. How many total years have you left your home community to do farm work?________

Obtain information on this page about each "at home" child (Question #3) 6-19 years of age or still in school.

	Names of children			
9. How many quarts of strawberries did ___pick today?(last typical day)				
10. How many quarts does ___generally pick an hour?				

Names of children

HOW MANY YEARS HAS IT BEEN SINCE___ WAS:

11.(a) Vaccinated for smallpox
(b) Was the vaccination at school? (If yes, enter "Y". If in a doctor's office, hospital, or elsewhere, enter "N".)

12.(a) Vaccinated for diphtheria whooping cough, or (or and) tetanus?
(b) Was the vaccination at shcool?

13.(a) Vaccinated for polio?
(b) Was the vaccination at school?

14.(a) Given a skin test for TB(tuberculosis)?
(b) Was the test given at school?

15.(a) How many years has it been since ___'s teeth were examined by a dentist?
(b) Was the examination at school?

16. About how many days has ___ been sick during the last twelve months?

17. How many years has it been since ___ was examined by a doctor?

18. How many years has it been since ___ first started school?

19. Did ___ go to school this last school year?

IF "NO", SKIP TO QUESTION # 29

20. If so, what is the name of the school? (If ___ went to more than one school, the name of the one attended most.)

21. While in your home community, how many days of school did ___ miss during the last school year because of:

Names of children

(a) Work?
(b) Not liking school?
(c) Bad weather and lack of transportation?
(d) Sickness?
(e) All other reasons? (specify)
(f) Total days missed.

22. What is the highest grade you expect ___ to finish? (probable highest grade)

23. What is the highest grade you would like to see ___ finish?

24. Would you prefer that ___ go that far instead of taking a good-paying job if he (she) can get it?

25. What is the highest grade ___ would like to finish?

26. How much does ___ like school? (V) Very much, (M) Much, (S) Some, (L) Little, (N) Not at all.

27. Does ___ complain about moving from place to place and away from his (her) playmates? (Omit if this is the only place away from home he has been.)

28. When does the school year in your home community:
(a) Begin?____________________ (b) End?____________________

29. Have you ever been asked by a school authority to send your children to school? Yes__________ No__________ Don't know or remember__________ No answer__________

30. If yes, When and where was the last time?____________________

31. Which member of your family reads the most?____________________

32. About how many hours has he (or she) read during the last month?______

33. Chiefly what?____________________

FOR CHILDREN AGE SIX OR OVER STILL "AT HOME"

Days attended school away from home community. (ONLY FOR NON_HOME COMMUNITIES DURING SCHOOL TERMS WHERE CHILDREN 6-19 YEARS OF AGE WERE ALONG.)

34. Did any of your children attend school at any of the places away from your home community that you went to during the last year? If so, which places and how many days did each child attend?

		Names of children 6-19 along			
Location Line Number 6 (a)	Locality 6 (b)				

35. Does your family receive as much medical attention as you think it needs? Yes__________ No_________ Don't know__________
Comments____

36. Would your family obtain more medical attention if it were much less expensive? Yes__________ No__________ Don't know__________

37. Are medical expenses a serious problem for you? Yes__________
No__________ Don't know__________

38. Do you have a car or other motor vehicle? Yes__________ No__________
Other (explain)____

39. If yes, how much, if any, do you owe on it? Nothing__________
Under $100__________ $100-299__________ 300-499__________
$500 or over__________ Don't know__________ No answer__________

40. Excluding for land and buildings, how much do your other debts total? total? Nothing__________ Under $100__________ $100-299__________
$300-499__________ $500 or over__________ Don't know__________
No answer__________

41. What do you like about working: (a) in this area?__________ __________ (b) on this farm?__________

42. What do you dislike about working: (a) in this area?__________ __________ (b) on this farm?__________

43. When do you expect to leave this area?__________

44. Where do you expect to go then?__________

45. Do you expect to return to work in this area next year? Yes______ No______ Don't know______

46. Why or why not?__________

47. How many days did you have to wait after you reached this area before you were able to start working?__________

48. How much do you get here for picking a quart of strawberries?______

49. Which of these years did you do work: (a) on this farm? 1953______ 1954______ 1955______ 1956______ 1957______ (b) in this area? 1953______ 1954______ 1955______ 1956______ 1957______

50. How good a job do you think the Employment Service is doing? Very good______ Good______ Fair______ Poor______ Don't know______

51. Are you living on this farm? Yes____ No_____ If no, where are you living?__________

52. Nature of present housing:
(a) Shack, barn, garage, etc.______ (c) Tent______
(b) Single family house______ (d) House trailer______
(e) Other (specify)__________

53. Floor: (a) Wood_____ (b) Concrete____ (c) Gravel___ (d) Dirt____ (e) Other___

54. Your family has: (a) One room___ (b) Two or more rooms_____ Your family shares one room with: (c) One non-related person___ (d) Two or more non-related persons___ (e) Other (specify)__________

55. How much a day do you pay for this housing?__________

56. Equipment furnished:

	Yes	No
(a) Stove	___	___
(b) Dishes & cooking utensils	___	___
(c) Beds or cots	___	___
(d) Bedding	___	___
(e) Electric lighting	___	___
(f) Running water in living quarters .	___	___

	Yes	No
(g) Running water elsewhere.	___	___
(h) Refrigeration.	___	___
(i) Other (specify).	___	___

57. Laundry facilities: (a) Automatic washer___ (b) Non-automatic washer____ (c) Tubs, etc.____ (d) Stream or pond only____ (e) None____

58. Toilet facilities: (a) Flush toilet in living quarters____ (b) Flush toilet elsewhere____ (c) Outdoor privy____ (d) None____

59. Bathing facilities: (a) Modern tub or shower in living quarters____ (b) Modern tub or shower elsewhere____ (c) Washtub____ (d) Stream or pond only____ (e) None____

60. If respondent appears to have Spanish-American background, how well does he speak English? (a) Very poorly____ (b) Poorly____ (c) Well___

61. White_____ Negro_____ Other minority category (specify)____________

62. Do you have any neighbors or friends in your home community who might consider coming here to pick strawberries? Yes____ No____ Don't know____

63. (If yes) Why didn't they come this year?______________________

64. Under what conditions do you think they would come?______________

65. In general, how do you feel that migrant workers in this community are treated? (a) Very friendly____ (b) Somewhat friendly____ (c) Neither friendly nor unfriendly____ (d) Somewhat unfriendly____ (e) Very unfriendly____

66. Basis for a, b, d, or e.______________________________

67. How do you think people in this community feel about migrant workers?
____

68. In regard to how migrant workers are treated, how does this community compare with others you have worked in, not counting your home community? (Omit if he hasn't worked in other communities.) (a) Much better______ (b) Somewhat better____ (c) No difference____ (d) Somewhat worse____ (e) Much worse____ (f) Don't know or no opinion____ (g) No answer____ (h) Doesn't apply____

69. Basis for a, b, d, or e______________________________

70. What do you and your family do in your spare time here?__________

71. What do you and your family like to do in your spare time that you cannot do here?______________________________

72. What would you tell your children if they asked your advice on whether to choose migrant farm work as their occupation?____________

73. Do you plan to change to some other type of work within the next two years? Yes____ No____ Don't know____ Comments____________

74. If yes, why?____________

75. Are you reasonably well satisfied with the life you lead, including the kind of work you do? Yes____ No____ Other (specify)____________

76. What do you and your family consider to be your chief problems when working or looking for work away from home?____________

77. What do you think could and should be done to decrease this (these) problems?____________

FOR CHILDREN AGE 10 OR OVER STILL AT HOME:

78. (a) What would you like________to do when he (she) leaves home?____

(b) (Repeat for________) ____________

(c) (Repeat for________) ____________

(d) (Repeat for________) ____________

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION FOR 1957-1958 SCHOOL YEAR ONLY

Tentative Identifying Information Which May be Inaccurate:
(Please Correct Inaccurate Items)

Name of child:____

Name of parent or guardian:______________________________

Child's sex:______________

Probable age:______________

Probable grade in school last year:______________________

Information Needed:

Total days attended school last year:__________

Total days absent:__________

First day of attendance:__________

List of diseases for which child was vaccinated last year in or through the school:____

____

Highest grade completed by child by June 1, 1958:______________

Date school opened in 1957:__________

Date school closed in 1958:__________

Dates of cotton recess, if any:__________

Remarks about child's attitude toward school, if known:__________

____

____

APPENDIX D

ESTIMATES OF TOTAL NUMBERS OF MIGRANT EMPLOYEES

Strawberry pickers in the sample areas

The procedure for selecting the sample of migrants to interview was also designed to provide an estimate of the total number of migrant employees who engaged in the strawberry harvest in the spring of 1958 in the two areas of southern Illinois covered by this study. The main outlines of the procedure appears on pages 17-22 and further details of the estimation follow.

Within one or two days of the time selected for beginning the interviewing of the migrant pickers employed by a strawberry grower, the grower was asked the names of all his employees who were not local residents. On the Centralia-Irvington area large farms, 453 names were listed. It was estimated that the 16 cooperating farmers failed, unintentionally, to include the names of approximately 17 additional migrant employees. The operator of the seventeenth large farm objected to having any of his employees interviewed, the only such case. Assuming that the ratio of the number of employees to the number of acres of strawberries was about the same on this farm as on the other large farms in the Centralia-Irvington area, it was estimated that 16 migrant employees picked strawberries on this farm. Adding 17 and 16 estimated employees to the 453 names listed resulted in the estimate of 486 total migrant employees on the 17 large farms in the Centralia-Irvington area.

The next step was to estimate how many of the 486 had families and how many were single persons. In attempting to obtain a 30 per cent systematic random sample of the employees on these large farms, 88 with families and 33 single workers were interviewed. It was estimated that 8 more families and 15 more single workers, most of whom quit working within a day or two after the lists containing their names were obtained, were missed by the interviewers. Adding these to the cases which were interviewed produces estimates of 96 families and 48 single persons who should have been interviewed had the sampling plan worked perfectly. These figures furnish the chief basis for assuming that two thirds of the employees had families and one-third did not. Applying these proportions to the estimated 486 employees results in estimates of 324 migrant families and 162 migrant single workers employed on the Centralia-Irvington area large farms (Table 96).

Turning next to the Centralia-Irvington area small farms, 69 names of migrant employees were listed for the eight sample farms. Because there was inadequate reason to believe that the list for any of these farms was incomplete, 69 was accepted as the number of migrant employees on the eight farms.

Two methods were used for estimating the number of migrant employees on the eight small farms in the Centralia-Irvington area which were not included in the sample for interviewing of strawberry pickers. One was to assume that the number of migrant employees per 10 acres of strawberries was the same on the non-sample as on the sample small

Table 96.--ESTIMATED TOTAL NUMBER OF MIGRANT EMPLOYEES WHO WORKED IN THE 1958 STRAWBERRY HARVEST IN THE SAMPLE AREAS, AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES INTERVIEWED, BY FARM-SIZE CATEGORY

Area and Farm-Size Category	Estimated Number of Employees			Number of Employees Interviewed		
	Total	Families	Single Employees	Total	Families	Single Employees
Total	814	484	330	204	140	64
Centralia-Irvington Area:						
Large farms	486	324	162	121	88	33
Small farms	138	92	46	31	26	5
Cobden Area:						
Large farms	60	25	35	15	7	8
Small farms	138	43	87	37	19	18

farms. This resulted in an estimate of 57 migrant employees on the eight non-sample farms.

The other method was to assume that the ratio of the number of migrant employees actually hired to the number of adult male pickers the farmers had estimated in advance that they would employ was the same on the eight non-sample as on the eight sample small farms. Applying this ratio to the number of adult male pickers the eight non-sample farmers had estimated in advance that they would employ resulted in an estimate of 80 migrant employees on these farms.

Since it was not known whether 58 or 80 was the more accurate estimate, the two were averaged and this average, 69, was accepted as the final estimate of the number of migrant employees on the eight non-sample small farms. Adding these 69 cases to the 69 listed as working on the eight sample farms produces a total of 138, the estimated number of employees on the 16 small farms in the Centralia-Irvington area.

It was assumed that two-thirds of the migrant employees on the small as well as on the large farms in the Centralia-Irvington area had families and one-third were single workers. Hence, 92 was the estimated number of families and 46 the estimated number of single workers on the Centralia-Irvington area small farms.

In the Cobden area there was only one "large" (15 or more acres of strawberries) farm. An incomplete list of 51 employees was obtained from the operator of this farm. It was estimated that there were 60 employees on this farm, 25 of which had families and 35 of which were single workers.

On the sample of Cobden area small farms, 105 employees were listed. Of these, 22 were identified as having families with them, 50 came without families and nearly all of these 50 probably did not have families anywhere, and the family status of the remaining 34 employees was not ascertained. It seemed reasonable to conclude that about one-third of the employees on these farms had families and two-thirds did not.

There were two small non-sample farms in the Cobden area. On one farm the number of migrant male pickers the operator estimated in advance that he would employ appeared reasonable. On the other farm, because the comparable estimate by the operator appeared to be too high, the number of acres of strawberries was used as the basis for estimating the number of migrants employed for the strawberry harvest. The estimated number of migrant employees on these two farms was 25. Adding 25 to 105 produced the estimate of 130 total employees on the Cobden area small farms. Applying the estimated ratio of one family to two single workers to 130 produces the final estimates of 43 migrant families and 87 migrant single workers employed in the 1958 strawberry harvest on the Cobden area small farms.

Table 96 presents not only the results of the preceding estimations, but also the corresponding number of interviews obtained in each category. About 25 per cent of the estimated 814 migrant employees who participated in the 1958 strawberry harvest in the two areas of southern Illinois were interviewed. Twenty-nine per cent of the estimated 484 who had families were interviewed, whereas only 19 per cent of the estimated 330 who did not have families were interviewed.

The number of individuals who migrated was far greater, of course, than the number of employees. A large majority of the employees who had families brought their families along, the average number of family members migrating with the employees probably being close to three. Four times 484 plus 330 employees who had no families provides an estimate of 2,266 total individuals who migrated to the two major strawberry producing areas of southern Illinois during the 1958 strawberry harvest. The writers consider this estimate conservative because it includes none of the migrants who failed to find work and only a minority of those who worked only a day or two.

Migrants who worked on Union County farms in 1957

Information obtained in 1957 from 30 Union County farmers included their estimates by weeks for the year of how many migrants worked or were expected to work on their farms, classified by race, by age and by sex for those 16 years of age or older. To arrive at estimates for the

Table 97.--ESTIMATED NUMBER OF TOTAL AND OF NEGRO MIGRANT ADULTS, BY SEX, AND CHILDREN WHO WORKED ON UNION COUNTY FARMS IN 1957, BY WEEKS

(In this table the sixteenth birthday is used as the dividing line between adults and children)

Week	Men		Women		Children	
	Total	Negro	Total	Negro	Total	Negro
May 5-11	80	38	9	4	6	3
May 12-18	366	201	107	43	43	28
May 19-25	429	195	107	43	43	28
May 26-June 1	324	175	88	39	40	25
June 2-8	357	239	64	34	43	25
June 9-15	81	17	11	10	11	3
June 16-22	181	29	18	10	33	10
June 23-29	262	29	31	2	20	0
June 30-July 6	313	71	77	12	23	0
July 7-13	279	59	67	12	8	0
July 14-20	185	59	40	12	0	0
July 21-27	148	54	30	12	0	0
July 28-Aug. 3	77	37	10	2	0	0
Aug. 4-10	1124	73	354	13	179	20
Aug. 11-17	1225	66	373	14	187	20
Aug. 18-24	345	64	107	14	103	20
Aug. 25-31	205	40	72	12	80	20
Sept. 1-7	111	0	40	0	0	0
Sept. 8-14	198	10	110	0	10	0
Sept. 15-21	178	0	110	0	10	0
Sept. 22-28	88	0	30	0	0	0
Sept. 29-Oct. 2	68	0	10	0	0	0
Oct. 3-9	41	0	10	0	0	0
Oct. 10-16	41	0	10	0	0	0

entire county, the estimates of the 20 per cent sample of farmers who had not been reported as major employers of migrant workers were multiplied by five and added to the estimates of the 17 farmers who had been reported as major employers of migrant workers (see page 17). These data, the accuracy of which is not known, are presented in Table 97 on page 229.

The peak period of employment was during the first half of August, when the major varieties of peaches were picked. Only about one-third as many were employed during the strawberry harvest in May and smaller numbers during June and July, when raspberries, blueberries, tomatoes, cucumbers, early varieties of peaches and apples and a few other minor crops were harvested. Migrants were not heavily involved in the harvesting of fall apples.

APPENDIX E

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams State College Workshop on Curriculum for Migratory Children, Neil W. Sherman, Director. Laarning on the Move: A Guide for Migrant Education. (Mimeo.) Edited by Neil W. Sherman and Alfred M. Potts, 2d. Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1960.

2. *Agricultural Life and Labor Bulletin*, No. 36 (March 1960). 1751 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.: National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor.

3. Alway, Lazelle D. "Will you Make a School?" (Pamphlet) 419 Fourth Avenue, New York City: National Child Labor Committee, 1957.

4. Anderson, Otis L. "Migrant Agricultural Workers and the Rest of Us." (Presented at the Twelfth National Conference on Rural Health, Louisville, Kentucky, March 8, 1957) (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

5. __________. "The Migrant and the Rest of Us." (Reprint No. 3289 from *Public Health Reports*, Vol. 72, No. 6, June 1957) United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. Washington, D.O.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

6. Andrews, Wade H. and Saad Z. Nagi. *Migrant Agricultural Labor in Ohio*. Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin No. 780. Wooster, Ohio, September 1956.

7. Bennett, Fay. "The Condition of Farm Workers in 1957." (Report to the Board of Directors of National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc.) 112 East 19th Street, New York City, n.d.

8. Blackwood, Paul E. Report of Two Conferences on Planning Education for Agricultural Migrants. (North Central States Conference--Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 7-10, 1957. Southwest States Conference--Sante Fe, New Mexico, May 15-17, 1957) (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, July 1957.

9. Braun, Ruth H. *Homemaking for our Migrant Families*. (Report of Demonstration Project II, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin) Cleveland, Ohio: National Consumers Committee for Research and Education, Inc., 1959.

10. Brown, Malcolm and Orin Cassmore. *Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona*. Works Progress Administration, Division of Research. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

11. "Child Labor in Agriculture." Statement of National Child Labor Committee at public hearings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor held in Washington, D.C. on February 5-6, 1959. 419 Fourth Ave., New York City.

12. Cohen, Eli E. "The Education of Migrant Youth." (Text of speech delivered to convention of National Association of Secondary School Principals in Philadelphia, February 9, 1959) (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: National Child Labor Committee.

13. Colorado State Department of Education. General Summary: Migrant Education Projects, 1957. (Mimeo.) Denver, 1957.

14. Committee for Rural Development Program. "Using your Community's Health Resources." Rural Resource Leaflet No. 5. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Publications Office of the Agricultural Marketing Service, 1958.

15. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Labor and Industry. Regulations for Migratory Farm Labor Camps. (Mimeo.) Harrisburg, 1957.

16. __________. Regulations for Transportation of Migrant Workers. (Mimeo.) Harrisburg, 1958.

17. __________. Supplement to Regulations for Migratory Farm Labor Camps: Special Requirements for Crew Leaders. (Mimeo.) Harrisburg, 1957.

18. *Conditions of Employment of Agricultural Workers*. (Fourth Conference of American States Members of the International Labour Organization, Montevideo, April 1949, Report III) Geneva: International Labour Office, 1949.

19. Consumer Price Index, in *Statistical Abstracts of the United States*, 1959. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960

20. Council of State Governments and the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. Mid-American Conference on Migratory Labor. (A report on the conference held in St. Louis, Missouri, April 7-9, 1959)

21. Coverage of Farm Workers Under Workmen's Compensation. (Report of the Special Committee on Farm Coverage as presented to the 1947 Convention of IAIABC) (Reprinted by the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions from Bulletin 94, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards) Washington, D.C., November 1958.

22. "Disadvantaged Children and the World of Work." The American Child, Vol. 40, No. 4 (November 1958). National Child Labor Committee, 419 Fourth Ave., New York City.

23. Ducoff, Louis J. "Migratory Farm Workers: A Problem in Migration Analysis." Rural Sociology, Vol. 16, No. 3 (September 1951) pp. 217-224.

24. "Farm Placement Utilizes All Services." Employment Security Review, Vol. 26, No. 2 (February 1959). United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

25. Federal Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth. "When the Migrant Families Come Again--A Guide for Better Community Living." (Pamphlet) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955.

26. Fisher, Dorothy Anne. The Hired Farm Working Force of 1957: A Progress Report. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1958.

27. Folsom, Josiah C. Migratory Agricultural Labor in the United States. (An annotated bibliography of selected references) United States Department of Agriculture, Library List 59. Washington, D. C., 1953.

28. Gatlin, Curtis. "The Education of Migrant Children in New Jersey." (Pamphlet) Trenton: Department of Labor and Industry, 1960.

29. Geach, Gwen. State Migratory Labor Committees: Their Organization and Programs. (Mimeo.) United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

30. Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor. Report on Domestic Migratory Labor in Ohio. Columbus, 1958.

31. Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. Pennsylvania Migratory Labor Program (Final Report--1958). (Mimeo.) Labor and Industry Building, Harrisburg, 1959.

32. Governor's Study Commission of Migratory Labor with the Assistance of the Inter-Agency Committee on Migratory Labor. *Migrants in Michigan*. (An Handbook on Migratory, Seasonal, Agricultural Workers in Michigan) 1954. (This booklet may be obtained from the Executive Office, State Capitol, Lansing)

33. Greene, Shirley E. *The Education of Migrant Children: A Study of the Educational Opportunities and Experiences of Agricultural Migrants*. Migrant Research Project Board. 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, Department of Rural Education, 1954.

34. Gulmon, Lynn. "The Almost Forgotten Children." Rocky Ford Special Summer School for Migrant Children, 1959. (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education.

35. _________. "For Whom the Bells Don't Toll." (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1958.

36. Hiett, Naomi and Bernice Goodsitt. "Out-of-School Children in Illinois." *Public Aid in Illinois*, Vol. 25, No. 5 (May 1958). Springfield: Illinois Public Aid Commission.

37. Hill, Herbert and George Moffett, photographer. *No Harvest for the Reaper: The Story of the Migratory Agricultural Worker in the United States*. 20 West 40th St., New York City: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, n.d.

38. Howard, Ruth Boring. "Better Health for Colorado's Migrant Children." (Reprint from *Children*, Vol. 3, No. 2, March-April 1956) Denver: Colorado State Department of Public Health.

39. Illinois Commission on Children, Committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers. Guide and Survey Schedule to be Used by Communities Which Wish to Organize in Behalf of the Agricultural Migrant Workers. (Mimeo.) 522 East Monroe St., Springfield, 1956.

40. _________. "The Illinois Agricultural Migrant: His Family, His Children." (Pamphlet) 522 East Monroe St., Springfield, n.d.

41. Illinois Commission on Children, Sub-committee on Agricultural Migrant Workers. Sizing up the Situation on Agricultural Migrant Workers in Illinois With Conclusions and Recommendations. (A Report) (Mimeo.) 522 East Monroe St., Springfield, 1957.

42. ________. "Selected Activities in Illinois Which Illustrate Good Principles for Planning in Behalf of the Agricultural Migrant Worker and His Family." (Mimeo.) 522 East Monroe St., Springfield, 1956.

43. Illinois Department of Labor. Child Labor Law. Springfield, 1950.

44. Illinois Department of Public Health. "Health, Housing and Safety Guide for Employers of Migrant Workers." (Pamphlet) Springfield, 1959.

45. Johnson, Elizabeth S. Welfare of Families of Sugar-beet Laborers: A Study of Child Labor and Its Relation to Family Work, Income and Living Conditions in 1935. Children's Bureau Publication No. 247. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

46. Kantor, Harry S., Cora S. Cronemeyer, and Francis L. Hauser. Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers. Vol. I. United States Department of Labor. Washington, D.C., April 1960.

47. ________. Statistical Appendix to the Study on Problems Involved in Applying a Federal Minimum Wage to Agricultural Workers. Vol. II. United States Department of Labor. Washington, D.C., April 1960.

48. Karraker, Cyrus H. "Forgotten Child Laborers." (Reprinted from The Christian Century) 419 Fourth Ave., New York City: National Child Labor Committee, n.d.

49. ________. "Sweden's Farm Day Nurseries." (Pamphlet) 1137 Market St., Lewisburg: The Pennsylvania Citizen's Committee on Migrant Labor, 1958.

50. Kibbe, Pauline R. Latin Americans in Texas. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1946.

51. Koos, Earl Lomon. They Follow the Sun. Jacksonville: Florida State Board of Health, Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, 1957.

52. Landis, Paul H. and Melvin S. Brooks. Farm Labor in the Yakima Valley, Washington. State College of Washington Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 343. Pullman, December 1936.

53. La Tourette, William G. Relief for Farm Labor Headaches. (Trenton:) Glassboro Service Association of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, 1954.

54. __________. Survey of Seasonal Farm Labor Problems on Fruit and Vegetable Farms in the Southern Half of the State of New Jersey, 1953. (Mimeo.) Trenton: The Glassboro Service Association of New Jersey Farm Bureau, 1954.

55. Leone, Lucile Petry and Helen L. Johnston. "Agricultural Migrants and Public Health." (Reprint from Public Health Reports, Vol. 69, No. 1., January 1954) United States Department of Health, Education,and Welfare, Public Health Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

56. Levine, Louis. "Labor Market Situation for Migrant Farm Workers." (An address delivered at the Mid-American Conference on Migratory Labor, St. Louis, Missouri, April 8, 1959) (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

57. Lively, Charles E. and Conrad Taeuber. Rural Migration in the United States. Works Progress Administration, Division of Research, Research Monograph No. 19. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

58. Maitland, Sheridan T. and Dorothy Anne Fisher. Area Variations in the Wages of Agricultural Labor in the United States. United States Department of Agriculture, Technical Bulletin No. 1177. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1958.

59. Manis, Jerome G. A Study of Migrant Education: Survey Findings in Van Buren County, Michigan, 1957. Western Michigan University, Center for Sociological Research. Kalamazoo, 1958.

60. Marciniak, Ed. Toward a National Policy for Migrant Labor. (A report on the National Conference to Stabilize Migrant Labor held at Loyola University in Chicago, November 21-22, 1959) 21 West Superior St., Chicago: Catholic Council on Working Life, 1960.

61. Mexican Farm Labor Program. (Consultants Report) (Mimeo.) Consultants to the (United States) Secretary (of Labor). n.p., October 1959.

62. Migrant Children. A special issue of The American Child, Vol. 39, No. 1 (January 1957). 419 Fourth Ave., New York City: National Child Labor Committee.

63. Migrant Citizenship Education Project. Census of Agricultural Workers in South Cook County, Illinois. (Conducted for the Temporary South Cook County Council for Migrants) (Dittoed) 400 East 33rd St., October, 1958.

64. __________. Survey of On-the-Farm Housing for Migratory Workers in South Cook County, Illinois. (Conducted for the Temporary South Cook County Council for Migrants) (Dittoed) 400 East 33rd St., Chicago, October 1958.

65. Migrant Education Project. An Experimental School Program. (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education (1958).

66. Migrant Education Research Project. Bibliography. (Resource Report No. 1) (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, n.d.

67. __________. Graduate Research Opportunities in Education and Social Welfare. (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1958.

68. __________. The Teachers Say- (Mimeo.) (Reports from the 1959 Colorado Schools for Migratory Children) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1959.

69. "Migrant Farm Worker--Challenge and Progress." (Address by James T. O'Connell, Under Secretary of Labor, before the Mid-American Conference on Migratory Labor, St. Louis, Missouri, April 9, 1959) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, 1959.

70. "Migratory Farm Labor." *Washington Legislative Bulletin*, Vol. 1, No. 36 (November 22, 1957). 1025 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D.C.: The Council of State Governments.

71. *Migratory Labor*. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. 86 Congress, 1 session. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

72. *Migratory Labor in American Agriculture*. (Report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

73. Mirengoff, William and Albert Shostack. *Housing for Florida's Migrants: A Survey of Migratory Farm Labor Housing in Dade County, Florida*. United States Department of Labor and the Florida Industrial Commission. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

74. Mitchell, James P., Secretary of Labor. Address to the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, Washington, D.C., February 5, 1959. United States Department of Labor News Release, February 5, 1959.

75. __________. "The Farm Worker in America." (Address to the National Conference of Farm Labor Services, Los Angeles, California, February 23, 1959) United States Department of Labor News Release, February 23, 1959.

76. Motheral, Joe R., Howard E. Thomas, and Olaf F. Larson. Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream: Western New York, June 1953. Department of Rural Sociology Mimeograph Bulletin No. 42. Ithaca: Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1954.

77. Myers, Robin. *The Position of Farm Workers in Federal and State Legislation*. 112 East 19th St., New York City: National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, 1959.

78. National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. Information Letters Nos. 7-11 (March 1960-September 1960). 112 East 19th St., New York City.

79. __________. "The Plight of American Farm Workers--Related to the Mexican Farm Labor Program (Public Law 78)." (Leaflet) 112 East 19th St., New York City: n.p., n.d.

80. Nelson, Lowry. *Migratory Workers: The Mobile Tenth of American Agriculture*. Planning Pamphlet No. 82. 1606 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, February 1953.

81. New Jersey Child Labor Law Study Commission. An Interim Report. (Mimeo.) n.p., March 1958.

82. New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, Bureau of Migrant Labor. *The Key to Better Housing: The Field Inspector*. 12th Annual Report. Bureau of Migrant Labor. n.p., n.d.

83. __________. *13th Annual Report*. n.p., n.d.

84. New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. *Housing for Migrant Farm Workers*. Cornell Miscellaneous Bulletin No. 15. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1953.

85. New York State Department of Health. Health Education Program in Migrant Camps. (Mimeo.) Albany: Office of Public Health Education, 1957.

86. Pennsylvania State University, College of Education. *Childhood Does Not Wait*. (Report on School for Migrant Children, Summer 1959) University Park, n.d.

87. __________. *Report on the Pennsylvania State University School for Migrant Children*. (Ulysses, Potter County, Pennsylvania, July 14 through August 22, 1958) University Park, n.d.

88. Potts, Alfred M. 2d. "Construction of Curriculum for Migrant Children." (Resource Report No. LRS-SRS-1) (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, Migrant Education Research Project, n.d.

89. __________. *A Social Profile of Agricultural Migratory People in Colorado*. Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, Migrant Education Research Project, Resource Report E-1, 1959.

90. __________. Now We Go Too! (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, Migrant Education Research Project, 1958.

91. __________. "School Bells for Children Who Follow the Crops." (Reprinted from *The Elementary School Journal*) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1960.

92. __________. The Colorado Migrant Education Program of 1959. (Mimeo.) Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, Migrant Education Research Project, 1960.

93. President's Committee on Migratory Labor. *Migratory Labor Notes*, Nos. 5-12 (May 15, 1958-August 1960). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor.

94. __________. Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Labor. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, 1956.

95. __________. Suggested Language for Regulations of Agricultural Labor Camps. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, 1958.

96. __________. "Suggested Regulations--Transportation of Agricultural Workers by Motor Vehicle." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, 1956.

97. Proceedings of the National Sharecroppers Fund Conference on "Migratory Labor and Low Income Farmers," held November 13, 1957, in New York City. 112 East 19th St., New York City: National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc.

98. Program Directions in Migrant Labor of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Fiscal Year 1959. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., January 1958.

99. Report on Farm Labor. Public Hearings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, February 5 and 6, 1959. 112 East 19th St., New York City, 1959.

100. Report of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Migrant Labor. New York Legislative Document No. 20. n.p., 1958.

101. Rivera, Julius. Selected Characteristics of Two Migrant Groups Visiting Colorado in 1957. Denver: Colorado State Department of Public Health, 1958.

102. Shotwell, Louisa Rossiter. This is the Migrant. 257 Fourth Ave., New York City: Friendship Press, n.d.

103. Sutherland, Arthur T. The Migratory Labor Problem in Delaware. Women's Bureau Bulletin No. 185. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941.

104. Talbott, Mrs. H. A. (President of the Mesa County Migrant Council). "A Way to Extend Voluntary Activity and Organization in Social Welfare: Migrant Workers." (Mimeo.) n.p., 1957.

105. Teaching Children Who Move with the Crops. (Report and Recommendations of the Fresno County Project: The Educational Program for Migrant Children) Fresno, California: Walter G. Martin, Fresno County Superintendent of Schools, 1955.

106. Teilman, Mrs. I. H. "For Migrant Families: Ranch Owners Join with Public and Voluntary Groups to Provide Community Services." (Reprint from The Child, Vol. 19, No. 3, November 1953) Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau.

107. Tuuri, Arthur L., Helen L. Johnston, and Donald Harting. "Adapting Immunization Programs to Special Groups." (Reprint from Public Health Reports, Vol. 72, No. 4, April 1957) United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

108. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. The Education of Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers. (Report of Regional Conferences on Education of Migrant Children, Digest of Four Regional Conferences, May-June, 1952) (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., September 1952.

109. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Division of General Health Services, Program Development Branch. "Activities Related to the Health of Agricultural Migrants." (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., 1958.

110. United States Department of Labor. Report on Operations of the Domestic Migratory Labor Program. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., 1958.

111. ________. "Selected References on Migratory Workers and Their Families, Problems, and Programs, 1950-1956." (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., 1956.

112. ________. Bureau of Employment Security. Improved Conditions for Migrant Labor Pay Off for Growers and the Community. Employment Security Exchange No. 4. Washington, D.C., February, 1956.

113. ________. Proceedings of Consultation on Migratory Farm Labor, 1957. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

114. ________. This is How 12 Camps for Migratory Workers in Agriculture are Operated. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

115. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards. "Child Workers in Agriculture." Leaflet No. 4. Washington, D.C., 1959.

116. ________. "1959 State Legislation Affecting Migratory Agricultural Workers." (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., August 1959.

117. ________. Status of Agricultural Workers Under State and Federal Labor Laws. (Mimeo.) Washington, D.C., February 1959.

118. United States Department of Labor, United States Employment Service. "Do You Want Good, Steady, Reliable, Dependable Farm Workers." (Leaflet) Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

119. ________. "The Right Kind of Housing Will Help You Get and Keep Farm Workers." (Leaflet) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953.

120. United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contract Divisions. "Agriculture and Related Exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act." (Leaflet) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

121. ________. A Guide to child-Labor Provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Child-Labor Bulletin No. 101. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

122. United States Interstate Commerce Commission. *Motor Carrier Safety Regulations*. (Applicable to Carriers of Migrant Workers by Motor Vehicle) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955.

123. Warburton, Amber Arthun. *The Work and Welfare of Children of Agricultural Laborers in Hidalgo County, Texas*. Children's Bureau Publication No. 298. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

124. Webb, John N. *The Migratory-Casual Worker*. Works Progress Administration, Division of Social Research, Research Monograph VII. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1937.

125. ________, and Malcom Brown. *Migrant Families*. Works Progress Administration, Division of Social Research, Research Monograph XVIII. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

126. Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, Division for Children and Youth. "Migrant Agricultural Workers in Door County." (Mimeo.) n.p., 1951.

-4 3193 ③